

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3075. A bill granting a pension to Malinda G. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of Nellie P. Dunn; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

449. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. David Ogden and 75 other citizens of Rogers, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

450. Also, petition of Mrs. G. C. Stover and 379 other citizens of Mount Vernon, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

451. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of William Hemminghaus and 26 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

452. Also, petition of Eugene Hagen and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

453. Also, petition of Thomas Stone and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

454. Also, petition of O. W. Soutlea and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

455. Also, petition of Sue Kunz and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

456. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, requesting utmost consideration to the recommendation of the Rhode Island General Assembly that a member of the armed forces of the United States of America, representing the men who have been doing the actual fighting, shall be given a place at and shall be allowed to sit in upon the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

457. By Mr. HART: Petition of Italian-American Democratic League of the State of New Jersey, calling upon the delegates at the San Francisco Conference to oppose and reject the unjust claims of Marshal Tito for Trieste, Gorizia, and Fiume, or any other territory which rightfully is a part of the Kingdom of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition signed by a group of residents of the Ninth Congressional District of Brooklyn with reference to the recognition of Italy as an ally; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

459. Also, petition consisting of a resolution adopted by the Retired Policemen's Association, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., in support of House bill 456, to exclude from gross income the first \$1,440 in the aggregate of each year of all retirement, pension, and annuity payments, including, but not limited to, pay-

ments under the old-age and survivors law, Social Security Act, received during the taxable year by any retired employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

460. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors, city and county of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to adopt House bills 2032 and 2033 in furtherance of preventing beach erosion; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

461. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. Fred Scott, forman of grand jury, Thomas County, Thomasville, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment into law of Senate bill 181 and House bill 1296; to the Committee on Education.

462. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, legislative department, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to acquisition of a suitable site and designation of an appropriate monument in memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Library.

463. Also, petition of the board of directors of the American Stock Yards Association, Fort Worth, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to adjustment of unfair and unreasonable differentials in stock and packers markets without further delay to prevent increasing black-market operations in the same field; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

464. Also, petition of the Phillipsburg Rotary Club, Phillipsburg, Mont., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to inclusion in the Federal post-war building program an appropriation for the construction and equipment of an adequate tuberculosis sanitarium for the Indians at some suitable location within the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

465. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Quincy, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the San Francisco Conference and the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks proposals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

466. Also, petition of the American citizens of Polish descent, of Albany, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to adjusting the manifest unfairness of the limitation of the eastern boundary of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

467. Also, petition of Board of Education of the City of Garfield, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to designation of January 30, a national holiday in commemoration of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the committee on the Judiciary.

468. Also, petition of Hohn A. Davis, of Leadville, Colo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to adoption of a national lottery, the proceeds of which to be used for increasing servicemen's discharge pay and payment of the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

469. Also, petition of Texas Water Conservation Association, of Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in matters pertaining to the prevention of pollution of the water resources of Texas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

470. Also, petition of the Croatian Catholic Union of the United States of America, at Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expression of deep sympathy at the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

471. Also, petition of the Croatian Catholic Union of the United States of America, of Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their

resolution with reference to the introduction of their plea for restoration of historical boundaries of Croatia at the San Francisco Peace Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

472. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. W. E. Fonken, corresponding secretary, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and 51 other signers, from Hot Springs, S. Dak., urging the imperative need of passing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) at the earliest possible opportunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, April 16, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of grace and glory, in hours of confusion and commotion, we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee. Solemnize our hearts as we contemplate the ghastly cost poured out that the congress of free peoples may meet on our shores. Lift up our hearts with exultant joy that the United Council now convened is the inspiring vindication of the precious things that the powers of darkness sought to destroy—the free interchange of uncoerced and unregimented minds.

In this day of golden promise, when the molten earth can be poured into new molds, when the life of nations can be shaped into new patterns, so guide the servants of the people that they will gladly pay any price for peace on earth short of sacrificing vital conviction, truth, and integrity on the altar of compromise and expediency. With character that is more than charters and trust that is stronger than treaties, enable those who act and speak for waiting humanity to rise to greatness in this day of destiny. In the Name that is above every name, we ask it. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 26, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 24, 1945:

S. 37. An act to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes.

On April 27, 1945:

S. 105. An act to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation;

S. 122. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to

define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended;

S. 124. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924; and

S. 638. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a, and providing for the recording of veterans' discharge certificates.

On April 28, 1945:

S. 123. An act to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2603) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KERR, Mr. HARE, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GILLESPIE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2625) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 689. An act to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and Statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State;

H. R. 1525. An act relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens;

H. R. 1701. An act to amend section 2, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress;

H. R. 1719. An act to confirm the claim of Charles Baudet;

H. R. 1984. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and officers, for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2625. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] advising me that he has been suddenly called to Oklahoma on official business. I wish to ask consent of the Senate that the senior Senator from Oklahoma be excused from attendance on the Senate until the 10th day of May.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the senior Senator from Oklahoma is excused until the 10th day of May.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 41)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to \$485,000, fiscal year 1946, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### DRAFTS OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 42)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1946, for the Department of the Interior, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### CONTINUATION OF 3-CENT POSTAGE RATE ON NONLOCAL FIRST-CLASS MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION CONCERNING CERTAIN PRODUCTS AND THE RATIO OF IMPORTS IN RELATION THERETO (S. Doc. No. 38)

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 341, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to December 8, 1944, calling on the United States Tariff Commission for information concerning certain products and the ratio of imports in relation thereto, material supplemental to that previously submitted (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed under the previous order of the Senate.

#### PERSONNEL IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate employment of necessary personnel in the Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of the Commission, fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

A letter from the secretary of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, covering operations from July 1, to December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

"Whereas the women of America have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices incident to the building of this Nation; and

"Whereas they have shared equally in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American Republic and the ideals of free government against the aggression of tyrants and have participated, and are today participating, in the battles precipitated by the enemies of freedom; and

"Whereas this Nation was 'conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal,' and such declaration has no actual or implied limitations on equality before the law by reason of sex; and

"Whereas the rights of women before the law are much abridged in many States, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex, constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their livelihood and is a source of irritation and annoyance to many thousands of others who recognize in this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women which they have reached by their achievements in other fields of human endeavor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to adopt and submit to the several States the equal rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment is now pending before the Congress; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; ordered to lie on the table:

#### "Senate Resolution 61

"Whereas on the afternoon of the 12th day of April 1945, a war torn and war stricken world learned with tragic suddenness of the untimely death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of this Nation; and

"Whereas this Nation and the world have lost one of its greatest leaders of all time, who had gained the respect and love of all liberty-loving people of the world by his forthright and successful championship of the cause of the weak against the strong; and

"Whereas the heads of freedom-loving men and women everywhere are bowed in grief and



sorrow over the loss of a leader who had unselfishly devoted his health and his life to their cause; and

"Whereas, as President of this great Democracy, and with the immortal declaration, that: 'There is nothing to fear but fear itself,' and with a steady heart through defeat, opposition, and victory, he led this country through its most severe economic crisis and reestablished American faith in the future; and

"Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt has passed from his earthly labors, yet his memory will linger long; while his engaging and aggressive spirit will bless generations yet unborn, not only in his own country, but of all the peoples of all the lands of the earth; and

"Whereas great men are not accidents; but God takes the shuttle in His own creative hand, sends it through the loom of time, and in the warp and woof of mystery and fate is left a golden thread to the memory of the man destined to leave his mark on the age in which he lived. This leads us to the thought that God alone makes the great man; makes him great in the age in which he lives, and great in the generations which follow him. All history justifies and sustains this thought; and

"Whereas such a man was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Panoplied in piety, truth, integrity, and courage, and moved by a love for his fellowman, he grew in stature as he grew in age until it could have been asked of him: 'In what place, in what region of the earth, was not found the fullness of his labors?'; and

"Whereas to undertake to catalog his achievements would be to limit them; to undertake to recall and recount his benefactions to man would be to weary us with a list so long and to leave many untold; and

"Whereas he not only gladdened the hearts of his own people, but renewed and stimulated the hope of the oppressed in other lands as they lifted their tear-stained faces to God and the stars and prayed that they might be free. History will properly evaluate Franklin Delano Roosevelt's name, for in his efforts and accomplishments in behalf of his fellowman he builded to himself in the hearts of men a monument more lasting than brass and more enduring than the chiseled pyramids of Egypt; and

"Whereas when the electrical impulses flashed the message of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and sent it around the earth, there was felt the sigh of grief in the hearts of good men everywhere, while the tears of sorrow glistened on the cheeks of people in far off and strange lands; and

"Whereas we realize that we must yield to the inscrutable ways of Providence and bow to the will of Him who doeth all things well; and

"Whereas from the trials and exhausting work and study and the conferences at Washington and on the North Atlantic and at Casablanca, and Quebec, and Teheran, and Yalta, came the frame work of an international organization which represents the hopes and yearnings of all men for peaceful and sensible international relations throughout the world in governmental, economic, and social affairs. Not only our people but the officials of all Allied Nations were leaning heavily upon his storehouse of information and experience, and his sense of fair play, to bring to a successful culmination this greatest life work; and because of these facts his sudden death at this time is tragic and inopportune; and

"Whereas the Honorable Myron G. Bialock, for many years Democratic national committeeman for the State of Texas, is present in the capital building, and is prepared to deliver at this time an address in memory of our departed and beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That in the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt this Nation has lost a great President; its people a kind, vigilant, diligent and fearless friend, while the whole world has lost a great champion of human liberty; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That we, the members of the Senate of Texas, do hereby express our deepest sympathy to the members of his family; and that when the senate adjourns today, it do so out of respect to the memory of our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, deceased President of the United States; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the Honorable Myron G. Bialock be invited to deliver a memorial address to the senate in honor of our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and at the conclusion of the address, our chaplain, the Reverend J. E. Chester, be asked to offer a special prayer; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the widow of our deceased President; to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate; and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Whereas all Federal employees within the Territory of Hawaii, excepting employees of the Postal Service, have enjoyed a 25-percent differential in salary; and

"Whereas under the present law postal employees, together with employees of the Customs Service, are not specifically included within the benefits of the 25-percent differential; and

"Whereas there is provided a procedure under Public Law No. 880, Seventy-sixth Congress, chapter 919, third session, H. R. 960, approved November 26, 1940, title 2, section 3 (c), whereby a differential in salary rates may be established by the President of the United States upon report and recommendation by the Civil Service Commission; and

"Whereas following this procedure employees of the Customs Service in the Territory of Hawaii have been granted the 25-percent differential; and

"Whereas in granting said 25-percent differential to all Federal employees, including employees of the Customs Service, the Federal Government has recognized that living costs in the Territory of Hawaii are considerably higher than in the mainland United States, as food prices in Honolulu are 28 percent higher than in comparable mainland cities, according to the bureau of research and statistics of the Territorial department of labor, and rents have doubled in many cases: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Civil Service Commission, the Postmaster General, the Comptroller General, and the President of the United States be, and they are, earnestly requested to use their good offices to extend to the Postal Service employees within the Territory of Hawaii the 25-percent differential now enjoyed by all Federal employees within the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That said differential be made retroactive to the same date the 25-percent differential was granted to the employees of the Customs Service within the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That should the procedure to establish the differential be not applicable to Federal postal employees within the Territory of Hawaii, then it is urgently requested that appropriate legislation be enacted to care for said differential; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the two Houses of the United States Congress,*

the Postmaster General, the Comptroller General, the Civil Service Commission, in Washington, D. C., and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the United Lithuanian Organizations, of Norwood, Mass., favoring inviting a duly accredited representative of Lithuania to the International Security Conference at San Francisco; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEY:

A resolution adopted by the Citizens Council of the United Nations, of Raleigh and Wake County, N. C., expressing confidence in the American delegation at the Conference of the United Nations at San Francisco; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEY (for himself and Mr. BAILEY):

A petition of sundry citizens of Winston-Salem, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the \$5 use tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution to request that special order 300, revised, and special order 303 of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to icing of carloads of potatoes and cabbage be rescinded or amended, and that standard refrigeration be authorized and permitted

"Whereas the general assembly is informed by growers of potatoes and cabbage in this State that in and by special order 300, revised, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the icing of freight cars loaded with potatoes is forbidden, and that in and by special order 303 of said Commission, the icing of freight cars loaded with cabbage is restricted to one icing, either bunker or top icing, at the point of origin, and that, because of such restrictions, it is made impossible for growers of these crops in this State to ship the same to market or to accept orders for said products for delivery at any distance to the procurement centers of the armed forces because the same would spoil in transit; and

"Whereas in order to allow such growers in this State to market their crops without serious or total loss, and to accept orders from the armed forces for delivery at any distance, it is necessary that the railroads be permitted to furnish standard refrigeration: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby requested to investigate forthwith the effect of special order 300, revised, and special order 303 upon the potato and cabbage growers of South Carolina, and to revise or amend the same so as to require and to permit standard refrigeration of shipments of such crops by railroads; be it further*

*"Resolved, That the clerk of the house do forthwith transmit copy of this resolution to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., and to the United States Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from South Carolina."*

#### RESOLUTIONS OF SECOND KANSAS DISTRICT AMERICAN LEGION—PRESERVATION OF WORLD PEACE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference, resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the American Legion of the Second Congressional District, held at Iola, Kans., April 8, 1945, together with letter of transmittal.

There being no objection, the resolutions, together with letter of transmittal, were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS DEPARTMENT,

THE AMERICAN LEGION,

Blue Mound, Kans., April 22, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am enclosing a copy of the resolution adopted at Iola, Kans., April 8, 1945, by the Second Kansas District of the American Legion.

Thanking you for your stand on veterans' affairs, I remain.

Sincerely,

ROLA L. ROSS,

Commander, Second District.

REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

The resolutions committee composed of Virgil D. Wood, Glen A. Hayward, and Charles H. Rush report as follows:

*Be it resolved by the Second Kansas District, the American Legion, in convention assembled at Iola, Kans., this 8th day of April 1945:*

I

As the first attainment and primary objective of every loyal American is for the speedy and expeditious termination of the war, together with unconditional surrender of our enemies, we pledge our energies and resources toward this end.

II

Defeat of Germany and Japan will no more secure the peace than did defeat of the Kaiser 25 years ago unless we are willing to pay the price of a sound and continuing peace set in a framework of world order in which other races, other systems of government, and other philosophies of life must have their part. In order to attain this purpose, we believe our interests can be best served by the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented by whatever force may be necessary to preserve world peace.

III

We believe that the security and peace of this Nation, after victory, depends upon the maintenance of a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force, with an adequate reserve force.

IV

We again endorse the principle of universal military training and urge the Congress to enact suitable legislation in furtherance of same.

V

We again demand that the Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese leaders responsible for this terrible war be brought to justice and punished for their terrible deeds, just as would be any other criminal.

VI

We heartily welcome into the American Legion the returning veterans and suggest that they be given places of responsibility and leadership in the local posts.

We pledge to them our sincere cooperation in helping them to become adjusted to civilian life and in securing for them all their rights as veterans.

VII

We well realize that this country has become and remained great due to our system of free enterprise and the rights of the individual under law. We must remain a government of laws and not of men. We therefore reaffirm our faith in the American system of government and the American way of life.

VIII

We again urge upon the people of the United States that strikes be reduced to a minimum in order that our war efforts be not impeded in any way whatsoever.

IX

*Resolved*, That all aliens now residing in or hereinafter entering the United States be required to take out citizenship papers in a period of years subsequently to be determined by the Congress and on failure so to do to be deported.

X

Whereas it is the firm belief and conviction of the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, that the Communist Party and similar groups believe in and teach principles contrary to the Constitution of the United States and in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion; and

Whereas the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, is further convinced that only those who can without reservation take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States should be commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, is further convinced that those who believe in the principles of the Communist Party and similar groups cannot without reservation take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas*, That it is contrary to our democratic form of government that those who are known to belong to the Communist Party or similar groups be commissioned as officers in the armed forces of the United States of America; be it further

*Resolved*, That the American Legion, Department of Kansas, be earnestly urged to adopt a similar resolution to be sent to the national convention at its 1945 convention, containing a request to the proper authorities prohibiting the commissioning of those known to be members of the Communist Party or similar groups as commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States of America; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator CLYDE M. REED, and Representative ERRETT P. SCRIVNER.

XI

We have had a very successful Legion year, having achieved the highest membership in its history. We believe this due in large part to the efforts of our unexcelled leaders: Lee Kemper, department commander; Click Cowger, department adjutant; Rola Ross, district commander; John Justice, junior district commander; and many other distinguished Legionnaires, who have rendered unselfish service to their community, State, and Nation, and to our organization.

We are most appreciative of the excellent leadership that Mrs. Ruby Vossloh, department president of the auxiliary has given our State.

We have enjoyed this district convention. We are appreciative of the hospitality of the people of Iola. We acknowledge the fine efforts of those who have appeared on our program.

We, therefore, extend our thanks to the people of Iola, our comrades in Leslie J. Campbell Post of the American Legion and its auxiliary and all others who have contributed to our enjoyment, pleasure, and entertainment.

In conclusion we wish to extend to Earl Hunter, our past district commander, our best wishes and hopes for a speedy recovery. Respectfully submitted,

VIRGIL D. WOOD.  
GLEN A. HAYWARD.  
CHARLES H. RUSH.

LIQUOR ADVERTISING BY RADIO

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I received an interesting letter from Ken Randolph,

manager of KDON radio station at Monterey, Calif., expressing his opposition to liquor advertising on the radio. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KDON, THE MONTEREY BAY STATION,

Monterey, Calif., April 25, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Relative to your proposed bill prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertisements, we thought you might be interested in the policy recently adopted by this station, which reads as follows:

"No advertising of liquor, beer, or wine will be accepted. This also applies to establishments or portions of establishments engaged in the sale of liquor, beer, or wine. Current contracts will not be renewed at expiration."

We are in complete agreement with you in this matter.

Cordially yours,

KEN RANDOLPH,  
Commercial Manager.

RESOLUTIONS OF SECOND KANSAS DISTRICT AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am in receipt of resolutions adopted by the American Legion of the Second Kansas District in convention assembled at Iola, Kans., on April 8, 1945. The resolutions relate to the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations to preserve world peace and a number of other important matters which I feel are worthy of careful consideration. I therefore ask unanimous consent to present them for appropriate reference and that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

The resolutions committee composed of Virgil D. Wood, Glen A. Hayward and Chas. H. Rush report as follows:

*Be it resolved by the Second Kansas District, the American Legion, in convention assembled at Iola, Kans., this 8th day of April 1945:*

I

As the first attainment and primary objective of every loyal American is for the speedy and expeditious termination of the war, together with unconditional surrender of our enemies, we pledge our energies and resources toward this end.

II

Defeat of Germany and Japan will no more secure the peace than did defeat of the Kaiser 25 years ago, unless we are willing to pay the price of a sound and continuing peace set in a framework of world order in which other races, other systems of government, and other philosophies of life must have their part. In order to attain this purpose, we believe our interests can be best served by the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented by whatever force may be necessary to preserve world peace.

III

We believe that the security and peace of this Nation after victory, depends upon the



maintenance of a strong Army, Navy and Air Force, with an adequate reserve force.

## IV

We again endorse the principle of universal military training and urge the Congress to enact suitable legislation in furtherance of same.

## V

We again demand that the Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese leaders responsible for this terrible war be brought to justice and punished for their terrible deeds, just as would be any other criminal.

## VI

We heartily welcome into the American Legion the returning veterans and suggest that they be given places of responsibility and leadership in the local posts.

We pledge to them our sincere cooperation in helping them to become adjusted to civilian life and in securing for them all their rights as veterans.

## VII

We well realize that this country has become and remained great due to our system of free enterprise and the rights of the individual under law. We must remain a government of laws and not of men. We therefore reaffirm our faith in the American system of government and the American way of life.

## VIII

We again urge upon the people of the United States that strikes be reduced to a minimum in order that our war efforts be not impeded in any way whatsoever.

## IX

*Resolved*, That all aliens now residing in or hereinafter entering the United States be required to take out citizenship papers in a period of years subsequently to be determined by the Congress and on failure so to do to be deported.

## X

Whereas it is the firm belief and conviction of the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, that the Communist Party and similar groups believe in and teach principles contrary to the Constitution of the United States and in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion; and

Whereas the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas, is further convinced that only those who can without reservation take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States should be commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas is further convinced that those who believe in the principles of the Communist Party and similar groups cannot without reservation take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Second District American Legion, Department of Kansas*, That it is contrary to our democratic form of government that those who are known to belong to the Communist Party or similar groups be commissioned as officers in the armed forces of the United States of America; be it further

*Resolved*, That the American Legion, Department of Kansas, be earnestly urged to adopt a similar resolution to be sent to the national convention at its 1945 convention, containing a request to the proper authorities prohibiting the commissioning of those known to be members of the Communist Party or similar groups as commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States of America; be it further.

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator CLYDE M. REED, and Representative ERRETT P. SCRIVNER.

# FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS— REPORT FROM COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, for many months the Committee on Commerce of the Senate has been making a detailed study of a program for the building of airports throughout the United States. That study has resulted in the Committee on Commerce adopting Senate bill No. 2, which I am authorized to report today. The plan of Senate bill No. 2 will afford to the United States and to America in immediate post-war times a great program and a wide avenue for employment and will furnish to the United States a system of landing areas and airports which will place it ahead of any other country in the world in commercial aviation. The bill approved by the Committee on Commerce, which I am about to report from that committee, goes into detail as to how the program is to be carried out, and gives the States and their respective municipalities a highly important part to play in its execution and development.

From the Committee on Commerce I ask unanimous consent to report back favorably with an amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 2) to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 224) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill placed on the calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the Senator is anxious to have this bill taken up as soon as possible. If it is agreeable to the Senator, let me say that it is the purpose to recess today over until Thursday, and then when we meet on Thursday we could make this bill the business before the Senate and proceed with its consideration.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very anxious to have the bill considered and disposed of before Friday evening, because I am called upon to leave on official business Friday evening, and, if it be satisfactory, I should like to ask that the bill be made the unfinished business so that the Senate may know that it will be brought up Thursday on the convening of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada make that request?

Mr. McCARRAN. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I to understand that the acting majority leader has given notice that the bill reported by the Senator from Nevada will be taken up for consideration on Thursday?

Mr. HILL. Exactly. We are giving notice that the bill will be taken up for consideration on Thursday; in fact, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, as I understand, propounded a unanimous

consent request, to wit that the bill be made the pending business for consideration on that day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 937. A bill to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. OVERTON introduced Senate bill 939, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 939. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (Public Law 884, 76th Cong., 54 Stat. 1219), relating to promotion of Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## EMERGENCY FLOOD RELIEF

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there have occurred in the last few weeks very severe floods on different rivers and in different valleys in the United States. Such floods have occurred on the Red River in my own State, where an unprecedented flood stage was reached. They also occurred on the Sabine River and the Neches and Trinity Rivers in Texas, on the White and Arkansas and Missouri Rivers, and, to some extent, on the Ohio and its tributaries.

When we were met by a similar situation in 1944 bills were introduced to provide for immediate flood relief and also to provide for priorities to be given to farmers for agricultural machinery and implements and necessary parts to repair them, and an appropriation was made, to be handled by the Secretary of Agriculture, in making loans and grants to farmers who had suffered from the flood disasters.

I am introducing a bill along exactly the same line. The prior legislation was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and I suggest that this bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 938) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. OVERTON, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## INTERNATIONAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. TAFT) submitted a resolution (S. Res.

122), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas the future peace and security of the American and of all other peoples rest upon the achievement of mutual understanding among the peoples of the world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States urges the participation by the Government of the United States in the organization by the nations of the world of an International Office of Education, for the purpose of advising together and considering problems of international educational and cultural relations throughout the world, and more particularly for the purpose of organizing a permanent international agency to promote educational and cultural relations, the exchange of students and scholars, and the encouragement within each country of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups; provided that such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations, or their administration.

#### THE G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. FRANK T. HINES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject The G. I. Bill of Rights and Its Effect on Office Management, delivered by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, before the Washington chapter, National Office Management Association, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on April 26, 1945, and a related tabulation, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE PROBLEM OF RELIEF FOR POST-WAR EUROPE

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Hard Days of Peace," from the New York Times of April 28, 1945, and a news item under the heading "U. N. R. R. A. got 1 percent of food United States pledged," from the New York Post of April 26, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIAL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 26, on the floor of the Senate, a debate occurred on the disposal of surplus war material. I have received a letter from the Honorable Guy M. Gillette, Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, calling my attention to the remarks I made, particularly in reference to that part of my statement, as follows:

I wrote to Mr. Gillette and suggested to him that one-third of this equipment should be left at the camp and disposed of by sale there. I did not receive a reply to that letter. In the meantime notices had been sent to the local newspapers that there would be an auction of some of the equipment in that area on the 28th of April—that is, next Saturday—and that today purchasers would be permitted to view the various pieces of equipment. \* \* \*

I wish to let the Senate know of the condition which exists. So far as I recall, that action was taken by the Surplus Property Board and by no one else.

Mr. President, I wish to correct that statement, as I found on returning to my office that I did receive a reply in a letter written by Senator Gillette on April 13. It is possible that the purpose of my remarks was misconstrued, and I would like to review briefly for the benefit of the record what transpired between Mr. Gillette and myself.

At the time, Mr. President, I was in northern Wyoming. In the last week of March, I telegraphed Mr. Gillette from Cody, Wyo., relative to the surplus farm

machinery at the Japanese W. R. A. camp at Heart Mountain in northern Wyoming. I read that telegram:

The Heart Mountain Japanese W. R. A. camp, 12 miles east of Cody, is being discontinued. All farming operations have ceased, and in consequence there is a number of small tractors and trucks and other farm equipment to be disposed of. This camp is located on the 250,000-acre Shoshone irrigation project and in addition is adjacent to extensive farming and stock-raising areas. The farming equipment is badly needed in this locality and could be readily disposed of at good prices at auction sales at the camp, eliminating necessity of any transportation. Farm machinery and equipment throughout this area much depleted. Would appreciate your helpful consideration.

I received a telegram from Chairman Gillette, as follows:

Re your wire, Heart Mountain camp. While recognizing need for surplus farm machinery in immediate vicinity of surplus declaration, it was essential to consider the mandate for wide distribution of these limited supplies. Farmers in other States would resent allocation to one community.

During the following days, I learned that this equipment was slated to be shipped to Kearney, Nebr., which would eliminate it from all possibility of being sold for the benefit of farmers in northern Wyoming. So on April 9, I sent Chairman Gillette the following telegram:

The decision to ship all tractors, trucks, and farm equipment from Heart Mountain W. R. A. camp to Nebraska has caused keen disappointment over this whole area. This action automatically eliminates northern Wyoming from purchasing any of this equipment. Is it not possible to auction, say, 33 percent of property here and then ship the balance to Nebraska? I believe such action would help equalize distribution and save considerable transportation. Will appreciate your consideration.

The day after I sent this telegram, April 10, I was advised by the editor of the local newspaper that there had been received at the newspaper office a release from the Surplus Property Board stating that a considerable part of this equipment would be sold at the Japanese camp on April 28. That was last Saturday, and that was the sale to which I referred in my remarks. This release from the War Surplus Property Board was published in the Cody Enterprise, the weekly newspaper of Cody, Wyo., on the 11th of April. On April 21 I received a letter from Chairman Gillette, dated April 13, which makes no reference to the sale of this machinery or the notice of the sale, but confirms his telegram that I have already read to the Senate, advising that the local sale could not be made and finishing up—and I quote the last paragraph of the letter:

All of these factors enter into the decisions made by the Board, and I assure you that we were convinced against our will, because we were anxious to give the individual a chance to buy, and particularly those near the place of declaration.

I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that I am satisfied that a wise step was taken in selling this farm equipment on the spot; and in mentioning this on the floor of the Senate on Thursday last, it was in the hope that I could do justice to the Surplus Property Board and con-

vey to Senators that an effort was being made to sell this equipment where it was located and where it was urgently needed, rather than to ship it to some center where it could be of no benefit to the people of my State. I believe it was a wise decision of the Surplus Property Board; I commend them for it, and I hope and trust it will be followed by many similar decisions. My thought is praise for the Board and not criticism.

#### JOINT ACTION BY UNITED NATIONS IN WAR WITH JAPAN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, last Saturday night my wife and I sat in our apartment listening to the radio broadcasting the wonderful news (which later proved to be a rumor) that Germany had surrendered unconditionally.

Like millions of other fathers and mothers of boys and girls in the service, we listened with a prayer of thankfulness in our hearts that our son now in Germany was safe and that one dreadful phase of the war was over.

Then my wife remarked: "I wonder if Tom will be able to come home before he is sent to fight against Japan?"

This remark set me to thinking. Since victory in Europe is only a matter of days, or perchance hours, what about the war with Japan?

How much longer must our boys be called upon to give their lives, and just how much help are we going to receive, in bringing this one remaining aggressor nation to total submission?

Right now in San Francisco the 46 United Nations are in the process of forming plans to prevent future wars and to agree to join together in suppressing any aggressor nation.

The eyes of the world are now turned to this Conference.

With hope in their hearts, with prayers on their lips, and with faith in the integrity and courage of their leaders, all peace-loving peoples are looking forward to victory and everlasting peace.

The thought occurred to me: What a wonderful thing it would be if these 46 nations would now issue an ultimatum to Japan that unless they agreed to surrender unconditionally within a certain period of time, all 46 nations would agree to declare war on Japan and each help in some measure in furnishing men and materials.

Can you think, Mr. President, of anything that would help the morale of our soldiers and of all the peace-loving peoples of the world more than to have such a pledge from all the nations attending the Conference?

America will never falter in its course of duty; our production will not lag, and the bravery of our soldiers will not diminish. But the United States and a few other nations should no longer be expected to carry the full burden against Japan.

If all are equally sincere in their hate of tyranny and equally passionate in their love of freedom, let them demonstrate it now.

Upon the willingness of the peoples represented at San Francisco to fight side by side in the battle line and share equally in the sacrifice, rests the ultimate decision as to whether or not we and our



posterity are to live in a world of peace, freedom, and security.

No nation will ever again challenge the basic concepts of a free society if it is once taught that it must fight alone against a world that is at least united and unafraid.

May the strength and counsel of Almighty God bear heavily on the minds of those who must and shall decide.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on the agricultural appropriations bill, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 9, 10, 15, 18, 27, 28, 30, 34, 44, 45, 46, and 53.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 16, 17, 20, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 47, and 48 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,730,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$906,990"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,888,589"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,663,708"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$42,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,206,208"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$445,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,298,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,649,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and no loan, excepting those to eligible veterans, shall be made in an amount greater than fifteen per centum above the census value of the average farm unit of thirty acres and more in the country, parish, or locality where the purchase is made, as determined by the 1940 farm census"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$80,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 22, 24, 26, 42, and 50.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
M. E. TYDINGS,  
J. H. BANKHEAD,  
ELMER THOMAS,  
CHAN GURNEY,  
CLYDE M. REED,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

M. C. TARVER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,  
H. CARL ANDERSEN (except  
as to Amendment 33),  
WALT HORAN,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. In connection with the report there is one matter which I desire to mention briefly. In years past there has been some difficulty in handling the funds made available to the Farm Security Administration for tenant purchase loans. That was due to restric-

tive language which was included in the House bill. It limited the amount of the loan on any one piece of land to the average value of farms in excess of 30 acres in the county, parish, or community where the loan was made. The same language appears in the conference report, with the exception that a leeway of 15 percent in the census values is allowed for the loans which are to be made next year. That should in some degree ease the situation which has heretofore confronted the Farm Security Administration in making loans to tenants to enable them to become landowners.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the Senator takes the floor will he yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Georgia could very well have given a short history of the agricultural appropriation bill. The Senate amended the bill in 52 respects. The conferees agreed upon 50 of those amendments, leaving only two in controversy between the House and the Senate conferees. The House conferees refused to agree to those two amendments and asked to go back to the House for a vote on them. They went back to the House for a vote and the House by a substantial majority affirmed and accepted the Senate amendments, which makes it so easy today to dispose of the conference report submitted by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, instead of taking a day or two or three on it, as heretofore.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas is one of the most valued members of our committee. He has correctly stated the action of the conferees, except that he overlooks the fact that there was in disagreement some language with respect to the Case-Wheeler Act, and the House refused to accept the language approved by the Senate. I am therefore placed in the position of moving to recede from that amendment. With that exception, the bill took the course as indicated by the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I hope the Senate will recede, and no doubt it will. If we could have had an agreement in the conference on everything except that language, we would have receded in conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments in disagreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2689, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 25, 1945.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 3, 24, 26, and 42 to the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22 to said bill and concur therein with an

amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$842,861"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 50 to said bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 50.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that completes legislative action on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; it is a final disposition of the bill.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF SHOWING IN CAUCUS ROOM OF MOTION PICTURES OF GERMAN ATROCITIES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I beg to announce to the Senate that the Pathe News will give two preview showings in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building of the pictures of German atrocities. The first showing will be at 3 o'clock p. m. today and the second showing will be at 3:30 p. m. today. All Members of the Senate and the staff of the Senate and of Senate Members are invited to one or both showings.

#### THE PRINCIPLES AND A PATTERN FOR THE PEACE—ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT G. SIMMONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an article "The Principles and a Pattern for the Peace," written by the Honorable Robert G. Simmons, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Nebraska, which was included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1950.

Chief Justice Simmons was formerly for five terms a Member of Congress, ably representing the Sixth District of Nebraska in the House of Representatives. His article is particularly timely in view of the conference now meeting at San Francisco, and is a grand approach to a difficult problem. It is a masterpiece of simplicity and clarity. The path to an enduring peace which he charts not only appears easier, but convinces the reader that the ultimate hoped-for goal is certainly not too difficult of attainment.

Chief Justice Simmons sets forth self-evident truths which cannot too often be recalled to the mind of man.

Note this admonition:

Men have \* \* \* rights.

And this historical approach:

They realized that something had to be done to assure peace, liberty, the well-being of all.

And this clinching argument:

Our perplexities are no more difficult to us now than theirs were to them then.

And this pattern:

Should we not, can we not, now go to those same basic principles of the rights of men and of governments and, on our constitutional pattern, build the organization that will give the world the blessings that our system has given to us?

And this warning:

Any peace that is to be permanent and any organization that is to be acceptable must be founded on moral and spiritual principles that are understood by and acceptable to the peoples of the world.

And this plea:

It is to be remembered that, while officials of government may propose, the effective result will depend upon the final willingness of the peoples affected to make the sustained sacrifices and give the support that will insure vitality and power to such an organization.

And this concluding advice:

I submit it is worthy of a trial.

The foregoing quotations from the article by Chief Justice Simmons could well guide the delegates now meeting in San Francisco and the article written by him could well chart the course of world action.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### NOMINATIONS OF MIDSHIPMEN REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senate has just received from the President the nominations of 1,032 midshipmen. Nine hundred and seventy are nominated to be ensigns in the Navy, 27 to be ensigns in the Supply Corps, and 35 to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. This is the annual message received in regard to nominations of midshipmen.

If the regular course were pursued, it would cost the Government \$325 to have the names printed now and later when the nominations are confirmed. The names would cover five pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also extend materially the Executive Calendar.

Mr. President, in view of this situation, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to make a favorable report on the nominations, and that the nominations of these 1,032 midshipmen, now at the Naval Academy, who are recommended for promotion, be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, am I correct in assuming that the Senator's request applies only to the midshipmen who are graduating?

Mr. WALSH. Solely and alone to them.

Mr. WHITE. No officers are included?

Mr. WALSH. No officers.

Mr. WHITE. Ordinarily I dislike to see the rules of the Senate suspended and the procedure prescribed by the

rules disregarded, but I think there are perhaps reasons of an emergent nature why action on these nominations should be promptly taken, and I offer no objection. I hope the request will be granted.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none; the report will be received, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, May 3, 1945, at 12 meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenants with rank from May 29, 1945

Second Lt. James Hart Hottenroth, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Henry Hayes, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Henry Preston Halsell, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Elliott Carr Cutler, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Sam Ellsworth Cumpston, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. George Edward Hesselbacher, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Paul Young, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Bryan Newman 3d, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Reiley Finney, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Richard Malcolm Horridge, Air Corps (temporary captain).



Second Lt. Irving Rock Obenchain, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. John Earle Kennedy, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. William Harold Morgan, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Lawrence Willard Vogel, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. George Chambers Hozier, Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. John Winthrop Barnes, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. William Ward Watkin, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Leon Joseph Hamerly, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Edward Ambrose Martell, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. John Arnot Hewitt, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Yates Michel Hill, Signal Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Francis Paul Kolsch, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Daniel Arthur Raymond, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Jerrold Duster Snow, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Joseph John Schmidt, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Eric Castlereigh Orme, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Paul Robert Cerar, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Robert Maurice Rawls, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Alvin Dumond Wilder, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Philip George Krueger, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. William Tuttle Hamilton, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Miles Lowell Wachendorf, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Robert Peyton Tabb, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Second Lt. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Second Lt. Fred Edgar Rosell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. John Clement Mattina, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Mahlon Eugene Gates, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. John Pierce Beeson, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Roger Lee Russell, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Richard Louis Hennessy, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Charles Emerson Ragland, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).  
 Second Lt. Edward McWayne Wright, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Roger Alley Barnes, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Seymour Rubenstein, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Theodore James Michel, Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Edmond Harrison Leavey, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Francis Eugene Voegeli, Cavalry (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Eugene Leland Weeks, Signal Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. John Preston Sheffey 3d, Cavalry (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Carter Williamson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. John Warmington Atwood, Signal Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. John Baker, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Harold Archer Ogden, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Clyde Raymond Eisenschmidt, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Wayne Leonard Bart, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. William Hampton Edwards, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Charles Marshall Fergusson, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Peter Richard Moody, Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Horace Allan Lawler, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Gerhardt Christopher Clementson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).  
 Second Lt. Rosario Pietro Bonasso, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Thomas Matthew Rlenzi, Signal Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Theodore James McAdam, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Charles Fred Shutrump 2d, Signal Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. David Rowland, Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Rollin Thomas Steinmetz, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. John William Harrell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Edwin Felix Pezda, Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Ben Franklin Hardaway, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. William Russell Kraft, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Richard Eddy Gaspard, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Charles Malcom Mizell, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Raymond Patrick Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. John Clinton Cockrill, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Arthur Lawrence Lambert, Cavalry (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Garrard Foster, Infantry (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Kenneth Frederick Hanst, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Andrew Stevenson Low, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Garth Stevens, Infantry (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Lawrence Lofton Cobb, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Wilbur Deane Snow, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Second Lt. Campbell Palfrey, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Robert Davis Terry, Signal Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Carl William Stapleton, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Second Lt. Robert Bryan Short, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. El Roy Paul Master, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Robert Walter Fritz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Stanton Wayne Josephson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. William Edward Corley, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. John Randle Watson, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Roy Orval Smith, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Jere Washington Maupin, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).  
 Second Lt. James Alfred Vivian, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Philip Edward Horan, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Thurman McCord Brandon, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).  
 Second Lt. Philip Shaw Wood, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Philip Henry Riedel, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Lee Glasier Jones, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).  
 Second Lt. Marshall Waller, Signal Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Dale Eldon Buchanan, Field Artillery (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. George R. Allin, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Lawrence Lahm, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Paul Berkshire Woodward, Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Fred Ernest Holdrege, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Selmer Gustaves, Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Leonard John Pasciak, Signal Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. James Francis Clark Hyde, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Joseph Richard Elliott, Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Floyd Irvin Robinson, Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Charles Curtis George, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. John Paul Omans, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. George Raybourn O'Neal, Signal Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. John Douglas Reid, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Cyrus Edson Manierre, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Matthew John Redlinger, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Donald Eugene Simon, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Andrew Hudson Weigel, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. John Munroe Anderson, Air Corps (temporary major).  
 Second Lt. Charles Elbridge Howe, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Donald Hilary Connolly, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. John Edward Craig, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. William Burr Clark, Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.  
 Second Lt. Richard Arthur House, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Robert Clark Kates, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).  
 Second Lt. Edward Allan Munns, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Walter Dean Short, Infantry (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Joel John Dilworth, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Benjamin Ira Hill, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. George Rogers Seip, Field Artillery (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Lowell Stanley Nickodem, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Charles Howard Garvin, Air Corps (temporary captain).  
 Second Lt. Arvol Duane Allen, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Edgar Allan Rickman, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Samuel Hubbard Hays, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Roy William Ballard, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Richard Wood Maffry, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harold Windsor Rice, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Sam Powell Wagner, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. William Robert Hughes, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Horatio Claggett, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Frank Clark Scofield, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. James Knox Cockrell, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Ashton Ely, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Wayne George McCarthy, Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Jesse Lee Lewis, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas James Hanley 3d, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Severino Martinez, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Joseph Short, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Jay Jaynes, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Carl Comer Ulsaker, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert William Carpenter, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Cecil Kenneth Charbonneau, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Dennis Sitterson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Francis Joseph Roberts, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Chester Reed Ladd, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. William Davis Tatsch, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Albert Nicholas Thompson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Aloysius Ryan, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Mark Howard Terrel, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harry Franklin Boone, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Carl Columbus Hinkle, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Clarence Peck, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Walter Walton Dillon, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Russell Deane, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Lloyd McKee, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Boone Bartholomees, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Jacob Baer Cooperhouse, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Karl Nelson Retzer, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Henry Harmeling, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Nicholas Studer, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Roy Stanley Geiger, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Byron Arthur Evans, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Thomas Peter Iuliucci, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Henry Ivey, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Ira Welch Thompson, Signal Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Harvey Tarver, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. William Charles Warren, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Edward Lawrence Corcoran, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Philip Alfred Wyman, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Allen Everett Frawley, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. VanCleave Parrot Warren, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Thad Buck, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. George Denny Hughes, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Franklin Smith, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Lawrence Francis McGuire, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Howard Lay Burris, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Leon Stann, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Fred Cutting Tucker, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Charles Brooks Gracey, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Wyley Lovelace Baxter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Archibald Donald Fiske, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donald Frank Blaha, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Hilton Offley, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Charles Marmaduke Grimshaw, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Samuel William Koster, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Walter Harlan Peirce, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Richard David Reinbold, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Patrick Furey, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Charles Eugene Robbs, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Cloyd Plott, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Linwood Fogg Jordan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Henry Crosson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Norwood Wood, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Ulysses Grant Jones, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Claire Alfred Pelton Duffie, Air Corps (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Ralph James White, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Harvey Wirt Courtland Shelton, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Henry Hinkley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Houston Townsend, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Pierce Anthony Doyle, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Carroll Garland, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Willis Dale Crittenger, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Donald George Jackson, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Alfred Franklin Grieco, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Joe Dean Hennessee, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Albert Edward Hunter, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Douglas Cunningham Murray, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Lawrence Augustus Adams, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Roy Walter Johnson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Raymond Laurence Miller, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Richard Paul Yelding, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Hal Creighton McMaster, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. James Richard Pendergrast, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. William Edgar Gernert, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Ramsey Evans, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lee Emir Cage, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert William Beers, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Frank Wharton Williams 2d, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Arnold Berman, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Joel Beck Stephens, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Edwin Griffin Clapp, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Arthur Robert King, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Howard Martin Fender, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Thomas Hunter Crary, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Forrest Stewart Gatchel, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Wallace Biddle Frank, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Frederick Weston Hyde, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Clayton Adams, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Robert MacDougall Bringham, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Howard Westley Slaton, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Mark John Burke, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Richard Murphy, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Joseph Morgan Cannon, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. James Elwood Josendale, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Thomas Kennedy Trainer, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Morris Blair, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Edwin Hall Marks, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Albert Charles Reinert, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Frank Butner Clay, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Leonard John Blissenbach, Infantry (temporary captain).



Second Lt. Richard Cutler Miles, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Charles Russell Hill, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Claude Cleo Lumpkin, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Sidney Hooper Young, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Charles Kelly Bortell, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Walter Alfred Divers, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. David Darwin May, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Peter Talbott Russell, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Fuller Davis, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Gene Clifford Smith, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. David Clark Claggett, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Wilkinson Heard, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Vincent Lincoln Coates, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Burnett Spilman, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Hurst Westenhoff, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Daniel Edward Halpin, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John William Guckeyson, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Boursiquot Rose, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Ernest Johnson White, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Luis John Flanagan, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Richard Martin Scott, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Henry William Urrutia, Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Charles Ray Rogers, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Edgar Bergman Colladay, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Donald Eugene Deffke, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Edgar Shedd 3d, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Charles Carroll Fishburne, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Richard Patrick Brice, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Joe Virgil Morey, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Lawrence Eckert, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Leonard Samuel Marshall, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Jesse Richard Miles, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Rayens Grant, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Frederick Dana Standish 2d, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donnelly Paul Bolton, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. James Savage Braden, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Allan Richard Scullen, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lynn DeWitt Sifford, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Savage Braden, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lynn DeWitt Sifford, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Charlie Calhoun Coleman, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Samuel Withers Howell, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Allen Monroe Otis, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. William Morris Zimmerman, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Simmons Timothy, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Albert Edward Seifert, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Robert Rew, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Jerome Pershing Ellis, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Thomas Seelye Arms, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Eliwood Tylor Claggett, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Boyd Freeze Walker, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Kenneth Earl Dyson, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Edward Joseph Alleo, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Lucius DuBignon Clay, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Frederick Charles Uhler, Finance Department (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. George Doan Rehkopf, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Wilfred Craig Ford, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Samuel Hampton Henton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Albert McConnell Ward, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert George Brugh, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Myrddin Davies 3d, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Austin Patrick Byrne, Air Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Richard Stockton Field, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Alden McLellan, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Charles Campbell Ettlesen, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Thomas Hasset Ray, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Denis Crowley, Jr., Infantry (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.

#### MEDICAL CORPS

##### To be majors

Capt. James Willis Howard, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 4, 1945.

Capt. James Sherwood Taylor, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 6, 1945.

Capt. Jenner Garnett Jones, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1945.

Capt. Eaton Wesley Bennett, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 10, 1945.

##### To be captain

First Lt. Arnold Lewis Field, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 9, 1945.

#### DENTAL CORPS

##### To be major

Capt. Dean Stirling Beiter, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 10, 1945.

##### To be captains

First Lt. John Alexander Duthie, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 1, 1945.

First Lt. Perry Wilson Bascom, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 10, 1945.

#### PHARMACY CORPS

##### To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. James Thomas Haden, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 27, 1945.

#### CHAPLAIN

##### To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) George Jefferson McMurtry, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from May 6, 1945.

#### IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1945:

Winston S. Abernathy	Robert A. Bergs
George W. Absher, Jr.	Alfred McC. Bettis
Kenneth A. Ackley, Jr.	Albert G. Beutler
James T. Acuff	Stuart E. Beyer
Emil J. Adams	Harold Bierman, Jr.
Robert J. Adams	Charles L. Billings
William H. Adams	Charles E. Blackford
William S. Adams	3d
Lewis W. Adkins, Jr.	James H. Blaes
Wallace J. Agren	Donald D. Blair
Joseph F. Ahearn	John S. Blake
John J. Albright, Jr.	Theodore S. Bly
Albert J. Allen, Jr.	Luke J. Boggess
Homer N. Allen	Robert I. Boland, Jr.
Philip H. Allen	Jordan T. Bolton
William B. Althoff	William R. Bonham
Samuel G. Anders, Jr.	John G. Boniface
Alister C. Anderson	Thomas F. Booker
Kenneth E. Anderson	Joseph H. Boop
Raymond M. Anderson, Jr.	John J. Borbridge
Joseph J. Armao, Jr.	Howard A. Borgerding
William F. Armstrong, Jr.	Ernest A. Bouveron
Louis V. Aronson 2d	Llewellyn D. Bowen
Malcolm B. Arthur 2d	Roland A. Bowling
Courtland L. Ashley	Paul C. Boyd
Donn L. Ashley	Malcolm B. Braddock
Linsey S. Ashley	Edward A. Brady
Samuel C. Ashton	Robert L. Brady, Jr.
Bert M. Atkinson, Jr.	Linwood O. B. Branch,
Edward C. Atkinson	Jr.
Maurice A. Auger	Eugene C. Branson
Thomas E. Auger	William B. Brantner
William R. Austin	Ansel C. Brathet
Franklin G. Babbitt	Ralph C. Bretting, Jr.
Richard F. Babcock, Jr.	Alfred F. Bridger
Robert E. Bacchus	Daniel J. Brimm 3d
Adrian C. Back, Jr.	Benjamin M. Britain
Vincent LeR. Bacon	Howard J. Brown
John B. Bailey	Malcolm C. Brown 2d
Richard S. Baird	Richard W. Brown, Jr.
John H. Baker	Sherwin B. Brown, Jr.
Joseph C. Bakos, Jr.	Robert B. Brumsted
Lawrence C. Baldwin	John E. Bryant
Edwin L. Ball	Thomas A. Bryce
Hartley S. Bancroft	Fillmore B. Buchanan
Robert H. Banks	Jack E. Bucknum
George M. Bard 2d	Mariano J. Bucolo
Rudolph I. Bard, Jr.	James G. Bumstead
David A. Barksdale	Earl W. Burdette
John F. Barlow	John H. Burhans
Robert J. Barnes	Arde A. Burki
William A. Barnes	Donald L. Burns, Jr.
William B. Barr	James B. Burton
Vincent W. Barry	Lawrence J. Cahalan
Frederick F. Bass, Jr.	George A. Caldwell, Jr.
Ormon E. Bassett	Francis J. Callahan, Jr.
Theodore H. Batchelder	Herbert E. Camp
Kenneth E. Bauman	Joseph W. Campbell
John R. Baylis	Quincy K. Campbell
Donald C. Bayly	Reed W. Campbell
Chandler L. Beach	William E. Campbell
Henry S. Beard	Samuel L. Candler
Jack S. Beasley	William P. Cantwell,
Michael J. Belensky, Jr.	Jr.
James C. Bellah	Oscar L. Carey
Wilson C. Bellenger	John G. Carl
Aldo J. Benedetti	Walter P. Carlin
Harry L. Benjamin	Millard A. Carlson
Arthur K. Bennett, Jr.	Albert J. Carneghi
Robert M. Casson	Oscar C. Carr, Jr.
	Thomas F. Carroll
	James P. Cartmell
	William R. Casey, Jr.
	John B. Caskey

Henry A. Cesari  
Lloyd S. Chambers, Jr.  
Lloyd S. Charters  
Benjamin S. Chase 3d  
Thomas C. Chitty  
Nicholas P. Chokas  
Morris A. Christensen  
Kenneth C. Christian-  
son  
George M. Clancy  
Edmund T. Clark  
George T. Clark  
Robert O. Clark  
William D. Clark, Jr.  
Edgar J. Clayton  
George B. Clegg 3d  
Daniel J. Clements, Jr.  
Autry W. Clifton  
Robert C. Cline  
Howard E. Cochran  
Nelle H. Coe  
Charles Coffin  
Robert B. Cole  
Harker Collins  
John J. Collins  
John T. Collins  
Thomas J. Connel-  
lan, Jr.  
Richard G. Converse  
Donald O. Conway  
Edward W. Cooke  
Peter MacD. Coope  
Curtis C. Cordell  
Walter N. Corrigan  
Edward J. Costello  
Jack B. Coulter  
Clarence Couture, Jr.  
Charles A. Cox  
Charles B. Coyer  
Robert F. Craig  
William D. Craig  
Robert E. Crawford  
John F. Crehan  
John P. Critchley  
James H. Cronander  
Thomas L. Crooks  
Thomas J. Cross  
Francis J. Crozier  
Robert F. Cuccias  
Hugh Cullman  
William N. Culp, Jr.  
Jackson P. Culwell  
Arthur H. Cummings,  
Jr.  
James J. Cunat  
Basil Curnutte, Jr.  
Francis H. Curren, Jr.  
John G. Curry  
Lee G. Cutshall  
Lewis M. Cutter  
Demosthenes P. Dakos  
John C. Dale  
Gray O. Daly  
Richard H. Daly  
Richard B. Dana  
John A. Davis, Jr.  
Lonzo R. Davis, Jr.  
Robert A. Davis  
Russell S. Davis, Jr.  
Thomas E. Davis  
William O. Davis, Jr.  
Morgan L. Davison  
Charles E. Day  
Andrew J. Dearman,  
Jr.  
Albert I. Decker  
Edward A. Decker  
Robert G. Dee  
Emerson C. Dehn  
Anthony J. Del Vec-  
chio  
John J. DeMayo, Jr.  
James H. Demming  
Eugene Dente  
Robert J. De Temple  
John G. Devlin  
Robert W. Dibling  
George L. Dickey, Jr.  
Leslie W. Dienst  
Warren D. Dietrichson  
Robert L. Dise  
Phillip A. Doherty  
Joseph F. Dolan  
George B. Donahoe  
Robert Doran  
William K. Doty  
Francis S. Dougherty  
John J. Dougherty  
Findly M. Doughty  
Patrick S. Dowling  
Denise-James J. Dow-  
ney  
Carl N. Duberg  
Harrison G. Dudley  
Louis C. Dueterberg,  
Jr.  
John A. Dugger  
Robert C. Duncan  
Robert Dunn  
Richard A. Dunning  
William J. R. Dun-  
seath  
William W. Dupler  
Granville O. Dutton  
John C. Dwyer  
Thomas J. Dwyer  
William M. Eaton  
Myron Eckhart, Jr.  
Harold Edwards, Jr.  
James W. Edwards  
John P. Eells  
Michael B. Elliott  
Edmund H. Ellis  
George W. Ellis  
Robert L. Ellis  
Richard H. Ellsworth  
Wilson F. Engel, Jr.  
Henry A. Engelmann  
John W. Enyart  
John W. Erickson  
Arthur L. Erikson  
William W. Erwin  
William L. Fsarey  
Wesley Espy  
James G. Evans  
Richard A. Everist  
John D. Exum  
John F. Fagan, Jr.  
Robert J. Farley  
Harry C. Farmer  
James E. Farner  
William "A" Faucett  
Cyril T. Faulders, Jr.  
Percival N. Fenton, Jr.  
George Ferch 3d  
James W. Ferguson  
Francis E. Field  
Robert W. Finlay, Jr.  
Robert N. Finley  
Victor P. Finos  
Earl W. Fischer, Jr.  
Elmer H. Fisher  
James R. M. Fisher 2d  
Samuel L. Fiske  
Thomas R. Fitzgerald  
George M. Foglesong  
Charles T. Fontaine  
Charles J. Forquer  
James E. Forrest  
John J. Forrester  
William D. Forsyth  
Albert L. Foster  
James W. Foust  
Rice L. Fowler  
Eldon B. Frame  
Samuel Francis  
William J. Francy  
James B. Frankel  
George N. Frazier  
Herbert E. Fridge  
Frede F. Froehlich  
William S. Fryer  
Richard "E" Fuller  
William T. Fuller  
Fred W. Furland  
Frederick J. Gaebler,  
Jr.  
Alfred H. Gaehler  
George H. Gardner, Jr.  
Walter P. Gatewood  
Raymond A. Gaul, Jr.  
Robert H. Gautier  
John L. Gawf  
Richard W. Geaney  
Raymond J. Gear  
Harry C. Gee  
Norman F. Geer  
Howard B. Gibbs  
John C. Gibson  
John G. Giedt  
Carl R. Gieser  
Gall H. Gilliam  
Frederick N. Glaister  
William A. Glaser  
Claude M. Glenn, Jr.  
Allan N. Glennon  
Henry P. Glindeman,  
Jr.  
Charles C. Goldstein  
Edward D. Goloway  
Daniel C. Good  
Eli W. Goode  
Walter Gorak  
Jack G. Gordon  
Joseph J. Gorski  
Robert J. Gorton  
James "V" Goure  
Henry Graefe  
Sylvester M. Graff  
William S. Graham  
Earnest B. Granville  
Luther J. Graves, Jr.  
Jacob Green  
Joseph M. Greene  
Burniel K. Greenwood  
Earle S. Greenwood  
Charles W. Greer 3d  
Richard Grenier  
Charles H. Griffiths  
Nicholas Grkovic  
Charles D. Grojean  
Thomas E. Groves  
Jack E. Guentz  
Richard I. Gulick  
Victor R. Gullatt  
John G. Gullette  
Nels A. Gunderson  
Charles H. Guy, Jr.  
Peter P. Gwiazdowski  
Frank S. Haak, Jr.  
Alvia A. Hafer  
John H. Hale  
Robert S. Haley  
Arthur P. Hall, Jr.  
Richard P. Hall  
Walter D. Hall  
John J. Haller  
Harold A. Hamberg  
Luther Hamilton, Jr.  
Howard A. Hammell  
Stewart F. Hancock,  
Jr.  
Wallace W. Hankins,  
Jr.  
Robert J. Hanks  
John E. Hansen  
Anton C. Hansmann  
William V. Hanson  
Wade L. Hardy, Jr.  
Peter A. Haring  
Wick R. Harlan, Jr.  
Charles W. Harman  
Frank D. Harmer, Jr.  
Dale S. Harris  
James L. Harris  
Carten M. Hart  
John E. Hart  
Robert R. Hart  
Theodore R. Hartley  
Frederick R. Haselton,  
Jr.  
Robert H. Haslett  
Vaughan S. Hastings  
Atticus H. Hatsell, Jr.  
John W. Haupt  
Arthur M. Hayes, Jr.  
Wilford E. Hayes  
John L. Hayward  
Jerry D. Heath  
Donald A. Heberling  
Bernard A. Heesacker  
Thomas G. Hefferon  
Donald F. Hellwinkel  
Jerome E. Henderson  
William J. Henningsen  
George R. Herbert, Jr.  
John J. Herzog  
Charles M. Hess  
John R. Hess  
Monroe Heumann, Jr.  
Robert T. Hexter  
William N. Highsmith  
Nathaniel M. Hill, Jr.  
Robert B. Hilsabeck  
Lester G. Hinchcliff,  
Jr.  
John J. Holden  
Edward Holkovic  
Joseph T. Holleman  
Bennett W. Hooks  
Walter R. Horner  
Woodrow W. Hourigan  
James V. Houston  
George D. Howard  
William R. Howard  
Raymond E. Howe  
Richard F. Hubbard  
William E. Huddleston  
William M. Huey  
John A. Hughes  
James E. Hugus  
Cecil H. Hull  
DeWitt T. Hunter, Jr.  
Donald W. Huszagh  
Robert S. Hutches  
William A. Hutcheson,  
Jr.  
Rocco F. Iacobelli  
James F. Irvine, Jr.  
Donald G. Iversen  
Robert G. Iverson  
Charles E. Jackson, Jr.  
Joseph A. Jackson  
James P. Jackson, Jr.  
Laurence L. Jackson,  
Jr.  
Harold W. Jacobs  
John A. Jacobsen  
Arthur F. Jacobus  
Donald F. B. Jameson  
Edward Jamosky  
John A. Jandrall  
Norlin A. Jankovsky  
James H. Janson  
John A. Jennings, Jr.  
Charles McC. Johnson,  
Jr.  
Dean R. Johnson, Jr.  
John R. Johnson  
Montford T. Johnson,  
Jr.  
Oliver T. Johnson  
Peter W. Johnson  
Thomas P. Johnson  
Frank C. Johnston, Jr.  
Frank S. Johnston  
Thomson Q. Johnston  
Albert C. Jones  
Andrew L. Jones  
Francis F. Jones, Jr.  
John M. Jones  
William F. Jones  
Edward C. Jordan  
Holland B. Judkins, Jr.  
Louis La V. Junod  
William E. Kaloupek  
Brian "B" Kane, Jr.  
Alfred S. Karch  
John Kaufman  
Robert Y. Kaufman  
John S. Kearns  
Albert J. Kelley  
Jack D. Kelley  
Frank "J" Kelley 3d  
George R. Kelly  
Leslie D. Kelly, Jr.  
Charles E. Kendrick  
Edward L. Kennedy  
John W. Kennedy, Jr.  
Robert S. Kennedy  
Cletus W. Kennelly 2d  
Thomas J. Kenny  
John "L" Kent  
Eugene C. Kenyon, Jr.  
Francis X. Kern 3d  
Homer A. Key, Jr.  
William Killefer, Jr.  
David D. Kilpatrick  
Ord Kimzey, Jr.  
William T. Kinder  
Franklin T. King  
John D. King  
Kenneth K. King  
Edward J. Kingsbury,  
Jr.  
Arthur H. Kinneberg  
Lee A. Kirstein  
Charles E. Kloss  
George J. Klug  
Eldon H. Knappe  
Richard H. Knight  
Ferdinand B. Koch  
Simon W. Koenig, Jr.  
John F. Kohler 3d  
Roland F. Korbes-  
meyer  
Robert N. Krause  
Donald D. Kucharo  
Adam P. Kulik  
Robert M. LaBarron  
Dixon Lademan  
Albert M. LaLande, Jr.  
Kenneth R. Lampton  
Dwight A. Lane  
Edward Lange  
John C. Langford  
Justin E. Langille 3d  
Donald L. Larson  
Robert F. Latham  
Francis M. Lavelle  
Renn M. Lawrence  
Donald M. Layton  
Robert L. Ledbetter,  
Jr.  
Jerome A. Lee, Jr.  
William B. Leffingwell  
Armand F. F. Legare  
David T. Leighton  
Andrew A. Lemeshe-  
sky  
Walter G. Lessmann  
Robert J. Leuschner  
Saul Levine  
Robert S. Lichtenberg  
Richard G. Liebel  
Creighton D. Lilly  
Donald B. Lindsay  
John R. Lindsay  
Donald J. List  
John B. Little  
Ernest J. Litty  
Clarence F. Logan  
Sumner A. Long  
William F. Longton  
Theodore C. Lon-  
quest, Jr.  
Robert Looker  
Jack E. Loper  
Edwin F. Lord  
Paul J. Love  
John E. Lowell  
Ernest E. Lowen  
Cecil R. Lubitz  
Fielding G. Lucas  
Harvey E. Lyon  
James O. Lyon  
John W. Lyons, Jr.  
Kenneth H. Lyons  
Richard T. Lyons  
William A. Lyster  
Robert C. Mabbitt  
Richard W. Mabree  
Albert P. MacDonald,  
Jr.  
Harry R. Macdonald,  
Jr.  
Glen G. Macon  
John W. Macy, Jr.  
Hayden R. Maginnis  
Edmund B. Mahinske  
Milton C. Mapes, Jr.  
Luther W. Maples, Jr.  
William C. Marble  
John C. Marsh  
Harrison J. Martell  
Benjamin S. Martin  
John T. Martin  
Lealyn E. Martin  
John Mascenik  
Anthony M. Masich, Jr.  
William Massarella  
Howard A. Mather  
Ellery M. Matthews  
John J. Matusiewicz  
Charles C. Mauldin  
Richard D. Maxson  
Luther E. Mayes, Jr.  
George W. Mayo, Jr.  
Marshall T. Mays  
Robert E. McCall  
John H. McCalla  
Arnold K. McClay  
Robert A. McClelland  
3d  
Robert M. McConnell  
Thomas J. McCook  
Robert E. McCormack,  
Jr.  
Nelson J. McDermott,  
Jr.  
Robert L. McElroy, Jr.  
Clinton G. McGovern  
John R. McGrath  
Robert G. McIntyre  
John K. McKay  
Kenneth I. McKay, Jr.  
Irvin J. McKeand  
Robert P. McKenzie  
John A. McKinney  
John H. McKnight  
Robert B. McMurdo  
John F. McNamee 3d  
Henry M. McPhillips,  
Jr.  
Hezzie B. McWhorter  
John K. Mealy, Jr.  
Maurice L. Medcalf  
Robert E. Megee, Jr.  
William T. Melis  
Charles G. K. Memory  
Keith S. Messenger  
John J. Metschl  
Robert L. Metzger  
Richard L. Metzler  
Joseph S. Meyer  
Richard M. Middleton  
Charles R. Miller, Jr.  
Kirk C. Miller, Jr.  
Russell B. Miller  
Yale M. Miller  
Robert D. Milloy  
Herbert D. Mills, Jr.  
Lewis M. Millsaps  
Paul N. Mitchell  
Harlie L. Mize  
McFaddin Moise  
Brooke Montgomery  
William R. Montgom-  
ery  
George R. Monthan  
Herbert W. Moody  
James A. Moore  
Lester Moore, Jr.  
Robert B. Moore  
Richard S. Moore  
Thomas L. Moran  
Arthur J. Morrow  
Kenneth L. Morse  
William W. Morton  
Edison E. Mouton  
Dale F. Mueller  
Wendell B. Muncie  
David L. Munns  
John E. Murdock, Jr.  
Baxter H. Murphree  
John R. Murray, Jr.  
John T. Murray, Jr.  
Harry Muschenheim,  
Jr.  
Douglas J. Nankervis  
Valentin Nasipak  
Robert O. Newbern  
Dale E. Newman  
James E. Nichols  
Hubert M. Nicholson,  
Jr.



William C. Nicklas, Jr. William H. Robinson, Jr.  
 William J. Nicol Douglas F. Rodgers  
 William G. Nobmann David A. Rogers  
 Nicholas B. Norris, Jr. Frank W. Rogers  
 William H. Northrup Harris G. Rogers, Jr.  
 Corliss R. Nugent Harry M. Rogers  
 William R. O'Brien John B. Rogers  
 Joseph L. Ochoa Albert E. Rose, Jr.  
 Edward C. Olson Marvin I. Rosenbloom  
 Alfred C. O'Neal William S. Rothwell  
 Gerald P. O'Neil Don J. Roulstone  
 Henry Ortlund 3d Vernon K. Roux  
 Byron Osterweil Robert H. Royer  
 Vincent B. Otten John P. Ruckel  
 Russell "M" Owen Charles A. Rulon  
 Robert A. Page John A. Rusling 3d  
 Arthur V. Paletti Joseph W. Russel  
 Robert R. Park, Jr. Herbert E. Salter  
 Robert E. Parker Alvin N. Sampson  
 Frank Parrish, Jr. William H. Sandeford  
 Harvey S. Parrish, Jr. Milton S. Sartain  
 Forrest C. Parry Edward M. Saunders  
 Robert C. Parsons Walter E. Saunders, Jr.  
 Hugh B. Patton, Jr. Stuart Savage, Jr.  
 John A. Paul George H. Sawyer  
 George P. Pavis Robert B. Schabacker  
 Preston A. Peak Thomas M. Schiffanelli  
 Francis E. Pearson 3d Walter M. Schirra, Jr.  
 Robert Q. Pegram, Jr. Wesley H. Schmidt  
 Philip B. Pennington Herbert G. Schoonmaker  
 Rohe V. Pennington, Jr. Henry Schultz  
 Harmon C. Penny Paul A. Schwemley  
 John H. Penny Miles B. Scofield, Jr.  
 Frederick C. Perego, Jr. Jackson E. Scott  
 Jack B. Perkins Richard Y. Scott  
 William L. Perkins Thomas F. Scott, Jr.  
 Joseph S. Perszyk, Jr. Wiley A. Scott  
 Bernard Peters John A. Seargeant  
 William K. Petticrew, Jr. Stanley G. Seccombe, Jr.  
 William R. Pfefferkorn Gordon E. Selig  
 Henry E. Phelps Homer B. Sewell, Jr.  
 Robert G. Phillips Edward J. Sheehy  
 Robert M. Pickrell Benjamin F. Sherman, Jr.  
 John J. Pilcher, Jr. John R. Shields, Jr.  
 Donald F. Pillen Howard B. Shofner, Jr.  
 Marcellus T. Pitz Leroy B. Shrode  
 Philip F. Plummer Merle L. Shumaker  
 William B. Polhemus John A. Sichel  
 Justin Popa Nicholas M. Sidrow  
 William H. Porter Norris E. Silis  
 Robert N. Poulsen Minot Simons 2d  
 Denzil L. Pritchard William H. Simonson  
 Raymond J. Quallen James J. Simpson  
 Joseph B. Quigley William E. Simpson  
 William R. Quisenberry Joseph S. Sinclair  
 Richard D. Rabe LeRoy J. E. Sindell  
 Fred H. Radloff Edward O. Skidmore  
 Samuel G. Rae Joseph L. Skoog, Jr.  
 Richard L. Rahn Charles J. Slawson  
 David H. Rankin William E. Slesnick  
 Sherrill S. Rathbun, Jr. Joseph T. Small  
 Paul W. Ratte Daniel F. Smith  
 Troy G. Ray Donald W. Smith  
 George A. Reaves 3d Franklin Smith, Jr.  
 Lawrence E. Redden Henry P. Smith  
 William R. Reekie Joseph A. Smith, Jr.  
 Glenn A. Reiff James McK. Smith, Jr.  
 Samuel W. Reingvartz James R. Smith  
 John E. Renn James T. Smith  
 Hugh D. Reynolds, Jr. Lloyd S. Smith, Jr.  
 Harry E. Rhoads Lorin W. Smith 3d  
 Hallie P. Rice Perry N. Smith  
 Paul B. Richards William R. Smith 3d  
 Richard P. Richardson, Jr. Henry F. Snelling  
 Charles A. Riehl Denis Snider  
 Wallace M. Riggs Macon St. C. Snowden  
 Fred P. Ritchie, Jr. Robert B. Snowden  
 James D. Rives, Jr. Bernard L. Snyder, Jr.  
 Horace B. Robertson, Jr. Karl E. Sommerlatte  
 Robert H. Robeson, Jr. William G. Spangle 2d  
 Errol W. Robinson William S. Spangler  
 Gordon E. Robinson Harvey E. Spoerl, Jr.  
 Jackson R. Robinson Albert T. Sprague 3d  
 Phil T. Sprickman  
 William C. Stack  
 Lawrence E. Stahl

William R. Steers Charles W. Walker, Jr.  
 Robertson Stevens Daniel Walker  
 Fred A. Stevenson David M. Walker  
 Marshall T. Steves Earl E. Walker, Jr.  
 Jack R. Stickels Harry C. Walker  
 Hubert M. Stiles James W. Wallace  
 Richard E. Stockwell John A. Walsh  
 Cecil C. Stout Albion W. Walton, Jr.  
 Joseph S. Stoutenburgh Xenophon C. Ward  
 Walter D. Strang Martin C. Warmath  
 Frank T. Street, Jr. John L. Walsh  
 Paul J. Stueve James A. Wasner  
 William O'N. Suddath Harry A. Watson  
 Charles A. Sueur Jack T. Watson  
 Bruce M. Sullivan Jesse R. Watt  
 Joseph J. Sullivan Thomas B. Watt, Jr.  
 Richard J. Sullivan Roy B. Weaver  
 John A. Sutherland 2d Walter A. Weaver, Jr.  
 John M. Swanberg Walter C. Weaver  
 Earl T. Swanson William M. Webb  
 Robert McL. Swanson John D. Weber  
 Wayne H. Swanson William J. Weber, Jr.  
 George W. Tarleton Robert J. Webster  
 Conway A. Taylor Robert E. Weidner  
 Frank H. Taylor 2d Howard LeR. Weigle  
 John L. Taylor Robert A. Weir  
 John R. Taylor James E. Weirich  
 John R. Taylor, Jr. Robert O. Weland  
 Perry R. Taylor, Jr. Donald L. Weldon  
 Russell D. Taylor Robert H. Wertheim  
 Thomas E. Taylor Robert W. Wesson  
 William E. Taylor Richard E. West  
 Albert H. Thomas, Jr. Elmer T. Westfall  
 Harwell B. Thompson William F. Whalen, Jr.  
 John C. Thompson, Jr. Allan E. White  
 Robert D. Thompson Arthur T. White  
 William E. Thrasher, Jr. Ira R. White  
 Wilbur F. Tiemann, Jr. Lloyd R. White, Jr.  
 John M. Tierney Robert J. White  
 Emory G. Tiffany Stuart A. White  
 Clark W. Tinch Henry S. Whittier  
 Robert S. Tisdale Alfred J. Whittle, Jr.  
 Gordon H. Tittmore Lester C. Wible  
 William T. Toutant Frederic F. Wiedemann  
 Robert V. Towner Daniel T. Wieland, Jr.  
 William C. Travis Burr C. Wilcox, Jr.  
 Edmund J. Treacy Charles V. Wilhoit, Jr.  
 Jack D. Trombla Elbert H. Willett  
 Robert J. Trott Charles S. Williams, Jr.  
 Carl F. Turk Francis H. Williams  
 Miles D. J. Turley, Jr. Winston C. Williams  
 Harlan M. Twible William H. Williams  
 Robert A. D. Uhwat David C. Williamson  
 Charles D. Ullman Robert Williamson 2d  
 Harry N. Upthegrove Henry R. Wilson  
 Alexander W. Urquhart, Jr. Richard H. Wilson  
 Richard A. Vaill Rodney K. Wingo  
 Andrew J. Valentine Bruce A. Winner  
 Gabriel E. Valenty, Jr. Joseph R. Winslow, Jr.  
 James J. VanAntwerp Edward F. Wolf  
 Verlyn Van Curen John M. Wolfe  
 Alan J. Vandermade Charles E. Woods  
 Walter W. Vander Charles R. Woolums  
 Wolk, Jr. Robert L. Wright  
 Stanley K. Van Stone Donald M. Wynne  
 Richard S. Vardy Seymour Yalen  
 James P. Vaughan, Jr. Gordon L. Yeo  
 John W. Viele Robert H. Yerbury  
 Everton P. Vosburgh Erwin P. Young, Jr.  
 Jr. Levio E. Zeni  
 Henry M. Waddell, Jr. Martin "M" Zenni  
 Kenneth A. Wade Stanley Zipser  
 Paul R. Wagner Reginald R. Zisette, Jr.  
 Stoddard S. Waldron Richard A. Zyvoloski

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1945:

Alfred W. Albert Martin L. Frank  
 George F. Aroyan Willard C. Gieseke  
 William R. Baker Eugene Gralla  
 James L. Bellamy Augustine W. Hampton, Jr.  
 Alva M. Bowman, Jr. Kelley V. Holbert  
 Robert M. Boyle Norman R. Kephart  
 Thomas H. Clark, Jr. Leslie O. Larson, Jr.  
 Donald T. Conover Ray F. Larson  
 James W. Currie Simon J. Lonergan, Jr.  
 Frederick D. Eble

Malcolm W. MacDon-Robert K. Stoner  
 ald Richard C. Thompson  
 Charles M. Robinson Richard T. Tinney  
 Stephen W. Rowen William J. Vogel  
 Robert A. Spargo

The following named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 6th day of June 1945:

Saul H. Auslander Donald E. Holben  
 Paul W. Barcus Louis S. Hollier, Jr.  
 Roderick C. Bonner George E. Hosey, Jr.  
 Edwin "A" Burns John S. Kappock  
 John C. Butner 3d Thomas D. Kehoe  
 Marco M. Campanile Orin D. Krone  
 David A. Clement Clarence G. Moody, Jr.  
 Theodore H. Collora Robert F. Mott  
 Theodore T. Culpepper William H. Peck  
 Raymond C. Damm Chester O. Penney, Jr.  
 Frank E. Donner Robert H. Piehl  
 Robert E. Downen Lawrence F. Quigley, Jr.  
 William F. Dyroff Rudolph J. Radick  
 Thomas R. Freeman James R. Schoen  
 Nolan R. Gibbons Raymond B. Spicer  
 Gerald W. Gibson Joseph T. Thompson  
 Ronald L. Glendinning Charles T. Westcott  
 Joseph S. Hall

Ensign Jackson W. Clark, A-V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to be an ensign in the Navy, to rank from the 5th day of August 1942.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

##### IN THE NAVY

##### FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admiral, to rank from August 10, 1943

Carl F. Holden

To be commodores, to continue while serving as commanders of transport squadrons, and until reporting for other permanent duty

Edwin T. Short

Samuel P. Jenkins

Alexander S. Wotherspoon

To be commodore, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty

Harvey E. Overesch

To be commodore, to continue while serving as commander, motor torpedo boat squadrons, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty

Richard W. Bates

##### REGULAR SERVICE

The nominations of Winston S. Abernathy and others, to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 6, 1945, and the nominations of Alfred W. Albert and others, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from June 6, 1945.

##### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Saul Auslander and others, to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from June 6, 1945.

(NOTE.—A full list of all persons whose nominations to be ensigns or assistant paymasters in the Navy, or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, may be found at the end of the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today, under the caption "Nominations.")

##### POSTMASTERS

##### ARKANSAS

Dudley B. Hutchinson, Ashdown.  
 Gordon O. Thomasson, Magazine.

##### ILLINOIS

Harold Klink, Alton.  
 Victoria J. Kysicki, Dubois.  
 Woodrow W. Hynous, Fox River Grove.  
 Blanche Nelder, Godfrey.  
 Verna M. Boal, Hillside.

Foy I. Smith, Joy.  
Horace E. Hipkins, Liberty.  
Edwin H. Barmore, Winfield.

#### KENTUCKY

Anna H. Render, McHenry.  
B. Bates, North Middletown.  
Harry C. Thomas, Owenton.  
Jessie Mitchell, Salem.

#### NEBRASKA

Samuel Broekema, Hickman.  
Genevieve W. Pilkington, Wallace.

#### OREGON

Josephine M. Hogue, Grass Valley.  
Bessie K. Gardner, Huntington.

#### TENNESSEE

Rosamond V. Earnest, Afton.  
Mary A. Martin, Crab Orchard.  
Roy A. Gilbert, Jackson.  
George E. Bowling, Oak Ridge.  
Clyde J. Mahan, Russellville.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast illumined the earth with the radiant splendor of a new day, we are grateful for Thy continuing providence and unfailing love.

Grant that we may meet our tasks and responsibilities serenely and courageously. Give us a contributing and participating view of life, and may it be the goal of all our aspirations to minister to the needs of humanity and to seek Thy glory.

We pray that the officers and Members of this legislative body may be the honored servants of the Lord to keep our beloved country in the vanguard of the upward march toward the final triumph of righteousness and the building of the kingdom of peace.

In the name of the Christ our Saviour, we give the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 27, 1945, was read and approved.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 235) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Memorials of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### NEWS REEL PICTURES OF GERMAN ATROCITIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that Pathe News has arranged

to show in the Senate caucus room, 318 Senate Office Building, at 3 o'clock and also at 3:30 this afternoon some pictures of German atrocities which will be released later in the week to the theaters. The showing of these news reels will consume about 10 minutes. Members of the House and members of the Press Gallery are invited to attend either one of these two showings of the pictures, the first one at 3 o'clock and the other at 3:30.

Mr. Speaker, I am also informed by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that a resolution will be reported out of that committee, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will ask to call it up tomorrow, which I have agreed to. I understand this matter will not take long. It is an emergency appropriation necessary to take care of the Panama Railroad annuities and also an appropriation for St. Elizabeths Hospital to take care of patients that were not anticipated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to take up tomorrow, after reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and to consider under the rules of the House, the resolution to which the gentleman has just referred, House Joint Resolution 174.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would be willing to have the resolution taken up by consent. It simply provides \$600,000 to meet absolute obligations of the Government which cannot be avoided.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that it will not take any time to consider this resolution, could the gentleman from Missouri advise the House how long consideration of this resolution will take tomorrow?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust it will not take a great deal of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a prize-winning essay written by Pvt. Martin A. Watkins and in the other to include an editorial.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the St. Louis Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by P. W. Litchfield, chairman of the board, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the Akron Industrial Union Council, C. I. O.

#### THE ITALIAN FRONT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### NOW IS THE TIME

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should be encouraged to go to the war fronts at this time. They could go in groups of a dozen or more. Each Representative maintains the respect of his own district and Nation, and the public needs to know all the facts obtainable, especially at a time when the "werewolves" on the eastern front and the "rats" on the western horizon are howling and gnawing to the last breath.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a representative of the State press association of each State should be sent to the fighting areas, in order that the smaller daily and weekly papers might obtain the cold, hard facts which may be relayed to the folks in the short grass, forks of the creek, and every nook and corner of the countryside.

Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with many Members and I believe my observations represent the sentiment of nearly every one of them. I trust that my suggestions will merit the consideration of the Speaker and General Marshall.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the Springfield Republican.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to extend his remarks on the heroism of Pvt. John H. Dunn, Jr., and include certain dispatches setting forth the facts and in the other to include an editorial from the New World.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial from the Dallas News.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Times-Herald by Stanley Johnston relative to the fifth columnists in Mexico against the United States.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is nothing in that article that refers to the Weirs, the Pews, and the Du Ponts and other patriotic people in reference to being Fascists, is there?

Mr. SABATH. No. This deals with fifth columnists in Mexico against the United States.

Mr. RICH. As long as those men are doing as much for America as they are, there is no reason why we should insert articles in the RECORD trying to belittle them. They are great Americans, and we ought to honor and respect them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.



Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial urging the adoption of extension of trade agreements.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Wellington, Kans.

Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Legislature relative to the Jewish Commonwealth of Palestine.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of cancer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

#### TWO-THIRDS RULE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter which I wish to read into the RECORD. It is here called to your attention because it is unusual in its strength, simplicity, and the number of outstanding organizations signing it. The letter follows:

We, the undersigned, strongly endorse the Sumners resolution (H. R. 60) as a means of implementing American leadership in the cause of world peace.

The two-thirds rule must be changed. At no place in all American jurisprudence does the dead hand of the past lie so heavily across the path of the future.

The views of most of our organizations are expressed in the hearings before the Judiciary Committee of the House.

We are convinced that the vast majority of the American people are vitally interested in the passage of this resolution and hope you will give it your active support.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE WYCKOFF,  
National Board Member, National Consumers' League.

FREDERICK C. MCKEE,  
Chairman, Political Committee, Americas United for World Organization, Inc.

MILDRED G. WELT,  
National President, National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.

MRS. AUSTIN STONE,  
Legislative Chairman, National Women's Trade Union League.

MISS ANNA LORD STRAUSS,  
President Chairman, National League of Women Voters.

ANN KELTON WILEY,  
(Mrs. Harvey W.)  
Chairman, Department of Legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

MRS. NORMAN WHITEHOUSE,  
National Chairman, Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.

#### O. P. A. DELAY

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have on previous occasions commented on the terrible conditions existing in that branch of the O. P. A. which has to do with control of agricultural products, and especially fresh fruits and vegetables. I now arise for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the House a specific illustration of inefficiency, almost to the criminal degree, and show the cost of this inefficiency to the farmers.

Just prior to March 21, Senator STEWART, of Tennessee, and I requested Chairman FLANNAGAN of the House Agriculture Committee to appoint a subcommittee for the purpose of going into the problem confronted by the strawberry growers. He appointed the committee; the committee held its hearings on March 21 and 22, at which time representatives from the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. were present and testified.

The chief representative of the O. P. A. was Mr. Edward F. Phelps, Chief, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Branch of the O. P. A., who reported himself as being at the head of the Wholesale and Retail Price Section. At that time he was made well aware of the problem confronting the growers. The growers were then confronting a drought of many weeks. On about April 7 the strawberry-producing area suffered a frost, and the frost, together with that 6 or 8 weeks of drought constituted such a disaster that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics was called upon to make an investigation to determine to what extent the disaster had affected production, looking toward the adjustment of the price by the O. P. A. under the disaster clause contained in the O. P. A. Act.

The Division of Agricultural Statistics in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics gathered the statistics during the week of April 9 and it showed a reduction in production of 42 percent below average. This information was available to W. F. A. and the O. P. A. on April 16. I personally talked to all three agencies and urged that it be treated as an emergency, because the price under the O. P. A. regulation was forced down approximately \$3 per crate on April 15.

The report from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, signed by Mr. Paul L. Koenig, head of Agricultural Statistics, was sent to Mr. E. A. Meyer, Chief of Fruit and Vegetable Branch of the Office of Marketing Services, W. F. A., and a copy to Mr. Kenneth H. Jenkins, Food Price Division, O. P. A., who in turn passed this information to Mr. Frank Gindick, to Mr. Edward F. Phelps, and others in the Fruit and Vegetable Branch.

I, during this time, was pressing them daily and almost hourly, begging them to rush this matter, that the strawberry season was fast coming to a close, and unless it was put into effect immediately the producers would suffer irreparable

loss. This did not seem to interest them, and they went slowly on their way, while the Department of Agriculture stood quietly by.

Finally the order was issued by the O. P. A. and appeared in the Federal Register April 23, 1945, increasing the price 5½ cents per quart or \$1.32 per crate. Mind you, this was based upon a disaster which had occurred prior to April 10.

Now what is the effect of such careless, inefficient, and disinterested handling of this matter in two markets, which are just two of many in the strawberry section? At Wallace, N. C., from April 16 to April 26, inclusive, there was sold on that market 29,333 crates of strawberries. On the Chadbourne, N. C., market there was sold 20,004 crates, making a total on these two markets of 49,337 crates; and bear in mind that these two markets constitute only a small percentage of the markets in that marketing area. Multiply 49,337 by \$1.32 and we have \$65,124.84 representing the money which the B. A. E., the O. P. A., and the W. F. A. by their official acts admitted the farmers were entitled to; but the delay of the order deprived them of this.

These farmers had already been hit by frost and drought, and it seems to me that was enough without having men like Mr. Phelps, and Mr. Gindick and others juggling figures and delaying relief until the entire crop had been sold with the exception of 5 percent remaining in the fields.

It is high time this Congress should take official notice of such conduct on the part of officials and see that they are removed from office, thereby relieving the farmers' backs of unnecessary burdens.

While I am on this subject, and since I have spent so much time in tracing the history of this order and in observing the conduct of the Fruit and Vegetable Section, let me say that out of Mr. Edward F. Phelps' own mouth came the admission that they had provided for a mark-up of \$3.40 per crate for retailers. When I asked him on March 21 how they ever reached such unreasonably high figures and if he did not think that was an unreasonable profit, his reply was—and I quote him:

If you want my personal opinion though, I think our retail margin is slightly excessive.

In summing up this situation, I am forced to the conclusion that we have a group of ex-wholesalers and retailers operating the Fruit and Vegetable Section or Branch of the O. P. A. who are more than tough on the producers, will pay no attention whatever to the Industry Advisory Committees appointed, are very careful to protect retailers and wholesalers, and the public pays the price.

I quote here a statement from a member of the O. P. A. Fresh Berry Industry Advisory Committee from North Carolina, which, in my opinion, is quite interesting in connection with this picture:

It is my opinion that strawberries are no higher to the consumer during the first part of 1944 and until they were placed under a ceiling than they were after the ceiling was effective. The retail merchant has a right to mark up 34 percent on strawberries above the cost of berries delivered to his store. Such a mark-up he never dreamed of before

O. P. A. gave it to him. In other words, a ceiling on strawberries does not reduce the price to the consumer at all. For 15 years we have been building up the quality of strawberries through our system of marketing in paying the highest price for the best strawberries and our growers have made every effort to put up a standard quality pack in order to be rewarded in price, but now, with an exceedingly small volume and a very great demand, the growers get the same price regardless of quality, and this has caused him to disregard putting up a standard quality package, because, on account of the ceiling, he gets the same price for his strawberries. This will eventually establish a reputation for strawberries that the consumer will not buy our strawberries. In other words, a ceiling on strawberries will "kill the goose that lays the egg."

May I add here that, from my observation, I have reached the following conclusion, that it is high time for the Department of Agriculture to begin to give more of its attention to the all-important matter of furthering and protecting agriculture. The W. F. A. is not in line with the O. P. A. on the strawberry question—how many more commodities I do not know—nor are the officials of the Department of Agriculture; but these sport-model agriculturist and streamlined economists of the hipper-dipper type have moved into the O. P. A. and onto the Department of Agriculture and farmers and virtually taken over.

If the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Claude Wickard, is too modest to step in and put up the fight necessary to protect the farmers, then, as much as I like the gentleman, I wish he would step aside and let someone occupy that place who will have no hesitancy in curbing the O. P. A. when it begins to do those things that will result in not only retarding production but imposing hardships upon the producers.

Those of us representing districts that produce fruits and vegetables are quite familiar with both the attitude and actions of Mr. Gindick, Mr. Phelps, and their assistants in the O. P. A.; and I, for one, say it is time to remove those gentlemen, send them back to their wholesale or retail business, and let someone step in who can hold the scales of justice on a little more even balance.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions adopted by the American Legion, Second District of Kansas.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Reader's Digest.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to read the following letter I have received from a constituent:

The Hon. Wm. C. Cole,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a resident of Maysville, Mo. I have lived in India for 14 years in educational work, leaving there early last summer, and I have deep convictions concerning the necessity for Indian independence at the earliest possible date.

Will you kindly bring what pressure you can to bear upon the United States Government to call for immediate release of India's imprisoned leaders and for British announcement of a definite date, within 3 years after cessation of hostilities, for the establishment of Indian independence. India's leaders should be making their own decisions at the Security Conference at San Francisco.

Britain's reactionary habit of exaggerating India's divisions is no longer tolerable. The problem of the native states is a matter which can be taken care of by an Indian National Government. The liquidation of the majority of those autocracies is long overdue; and the so-called religious difference, for the most part, are a fire of Britain's own fanning, supported by relatively small reactionary national groups.

Britain's scrupulous concern for the minorities is not consistent with her continued repression of the majority. Seventy-five percent of her subjects in India—the peasants and laborers—are existing under conditions which the civilized world should no longer tolerate. For the promotion of the welfare of this majority the British Government has proved its inadequacy. The immediate liberation of India will prove the key to Asiatic faith in Britain and American efforts towards world peace.

Yours respectfully,

GAIL E. ASEEL,  
Principal of Forman High School,  
Lahore, India.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend some startling information to the Members of the House, relating to the sale of Government bonds, and the effect of Secretary Morgenthau's order respecting the cashing of bonds. In one bank, in the district which I represent, during the months of October, November, and December, 1944, bonds were presented and cashed in at that bank totaling \$404,687.25.

In the month of January 1945, the selling quota of bonds in that one bank was \$200,000. They sold their entire quota, and during that same month bonds were cashed by purchasers to the amount of \$76,369.62. During the month of Febru-

ary 1945, this bank sold \$200,000 of these Government bonds, and during that same month \$38,143.67 were cashed in at that bank, and in the month of March 1945, this bank sold \$149,419 of these bonds, and in that same month \$108,053 of these bonds were cashed at that bank. I have no report on the month of April 1945. However, it is distressing to these banks, who are making a supreme effort to sell bonds, to find that the bonds are cashed in an amount almost equal to the sales made—all because of the foolish order issued by the Secretary of the Treasury.

These banks find it very hard to sell these bonds in the face of this situation which has developed. I apprehend that this sale situation obtains throughout our country.

#### BE WISE AND ECONOMIZE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, did you get excited Saturday night when the flash came that Germany surrendered unconditionally; when the paper was sold in the streets, big headlines, Germany surrendered? That will happen. Japan must be conquered. That too will happen; when, we know not. After that, what?

A great change in America can, will, and must take place. World affairs will be in a turmoil. We must be sensible, sane, and sound if we will do the right thing for America. The World Conference for Peace will still be in session when Germany collapses. Our aid to the world will be necessarily limited, our promises will be great. Can we carry them out? Will our people approve more burdens, more regulations?

Our great need is Government reorganization. I was excited and jubilant at the statement of the Comptroller, Lindsay Warren, when he told the Congress last week that "you should go after Government agencies with a bush ax or a meat cleaver, or they will swallow you up." Let the House Members get excited and jubilant over that statement. Let the Speaker and the majority leader support legislation eliminating Government agencies, trimming down departments, taking the Government out of business, selling Government surplus property now without a lot of red tape.

Certainly you will have kicks, and some people in the department will holler. Let them holler, but you will have millions who will thank you later for doing the sensible thing. Do it now. Stop the waste and extravagance in the Army and Navy. Food is scarce and the starving world is needing every ounce we have to spare.

Let the United States be wise and economize.

F. E. P. C.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the following telegram:

Enforcement of F. E. P. C. Directive has caused partial walk-out of 1,400 employees of Shell Refinery, Deer Park, Tex. Situation tense. Stoppage of production within 24 hours apparent. Feeling high in Gulf Coast area. We urge all possible modifications of permanent F. E. P. C.

Signed by:

EMPLOYEES OF SHELL REFINERY.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an isolated case. There have been scores and scores of instances since the present temporary F. E. P. C. was created wherein directives have been issued which were arbitrary, ill-advised, and ill-considered, and which resulted in literally millions and millions of man-hours being lost to the war effort and irreparable damage done to the war program of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

#### PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of Congress I took the opportunity of visiting several prisoner-of-war camps in North Carolina. I did not find the pampering and over-feeding of war prisoners that I had heard about. The prisoners are receiving a substantial ration. I found no waste. I was surprised to find an allowance of beer, soft drinks, cakes, and candy, and cigarettes for purchase. This should be discontinued. Among people employing the prisoners, I was told they were doing good work. I was surprised, however, Mr. Speaker, on getting a break-down of the prisoners-of-war in North Carolina, to find that only 29 percent of the prisoners in my State were allocated to farming and other necessary labor. The balance of the prisoners were kept in camp for Army services. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the fact that there are only a little over 1 percent of young men from 18 to 26 years old remaining in industry and agriculture in North Carolina, I have implored the War Department to allocate more prisoners of war for necessary labor in the State, and particularly for agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a very informative news item from the Washington Star by James Waldo Fawcett concerning the retirement from Government service of that very famous Detroit, Alvin R. Meissner, head designer in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of background information in connection with the brief defending the congressional "power of the purse" with reference to the cases of Watson, Lovett, and Dodd now pending in the United States Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### INCREASE IN FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES IN CIRCULATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the greatest dangers to America today is inflation. This has been largely brought about by the tremendous increase in paper money in circulation. The amount of Federal Reserve notes has gone up from about five and one-half billion dollars to over \$26,000,000,000. During that period the Federal Reserve banks have bought from the market, in order to sustain the market, nineteen billions and over of Government bonds and that paper-money increase has very largely been used for that purpose. When we are increasing the paper money in circulation to provide the funds to sustain the Government bond market we are promoting inflation in a way that no possible governmental control action can stop.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including in the Appendix an editorial appearing in the Boston Post.

#### INFLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement from the Treasury showing the amount of money in circulation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds upon which he claims a question of privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a leaflet entitled "In Fact," George Seldes, editor, under date of March 12, 1945, appears a headline "Documentary record of a typical native Fascist, Congressman HOFFMAN."

Then, further down, "Native Fascist Bloc in Congress."

Then, on the following page, in black-faced type, is the statement "Call HOFFMAN seditious."

Then, further down, "HOFFMAN and the Fascist falsehoods."

Then follow later these words:

But every test of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that lying is confined almost exclusively to the Tories of the Republican Party and the Bourbons of the Democratic Party; in other words, only to the reactionary side.

The pamphlet, in effect, charges that the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan is a Fascist and reflects upon his integrity and patriotism in his representative capacity and raises the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, what has just been said, and from other leaflets put out by this same man, George Seldes, it appears there is a continued effort to brand not only individual Members of Congress as being Fascists, but a majority of the Members of Congress are charged with being Fascists.

I recall that since that leaflet of March 12 came out another one was issued, in which another Member of this House was charged with being pro-Nazi, was charged with being a Fascist, with being unpatriotic and disloyal. As it happens, I know the record of that gentleman. He holds medals and decorations for patriotic service in two wars. At the moment he has a son who is a major with the Army. Yet this man, this character assassin, goes on week after week publishing these charges against the people's Representatives and we do nothing about it.

On the 19th of April the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], inserted in the RECORD a statement put out by the War Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has it been fully established that the War Department issued that statement or authorized it to be made?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know; and perhaps I should qualify my statement about the War Department. The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, put the statement in the RECORD and it is headed "United States exposé of native fascism," and it is dated "War Department, Washington, D. C., March 24, 1945." Beyond that I do not know. I have not called the War Department.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. I asked the War Department for a copy of that statement and received a copy of it from them. They put it out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They gave you a copy?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no question about what the statute provides as to the use of Government funds. I wish that every Member of this House would read that statement. I shall just call attention to two or three statements in it. At first I thought it was intended only to discredit some of us who opposed New Deal policies, but after I read it I could not fathom its purpose. Listen to this statement:

Fascism is government by the few and for the few.

I wondered as I read that whether the gentleman intended to call attention to the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board, because the trend of those agencies is in the direction of government by a few.

The article goes on to say:

The objective is seizure and control of the economic, political, social, and cultural life of the state.

Of business. Surely the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] had no intention of referring by inference, even, to the late President's seizure of Montgomery Ward, to his seizure of other industries throughout this country; so I was somewhat confused as to what the War Department was getting at when it wrote that language. I read further:

The Fascists promised everything to everyone. They would make the poor rich and the rich richer. To the farmers the Fascists promised land through elimination of large estates. To the workers they promised elimination of unemployment—jobs for all at high wages.

Well, if anyone has promised any more than did the gentleman who not so long ago was the Vice President of this country, Henry Wallace, who is talking about 60,000,000 jobs, then I do not know who it is. He first suggested a pint, then later a quart of milk a day to each person in the world. But I am sure that neither the War Department nor the gentleman from Illinois was charging that our former Vice President was a Fascist. Or was it? Sixty million jobs. That is a promise of some magnitude. And so you might go on through the article.

Then, over on the next page appears this statement:

Listen:

Fascism cannot tolerate such religious and ethical concepts as the "brotherhood of man." Fascists deny the need for international cooperation. These ideas contradict the Fascist theory of the "master race." The brotherhood of man implies that all people—regardless of color, race, creed, or nationality—have rights. International cooperation, as expressed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, runs counter to the Fascist program of war and world dominion. . . . Right now our native Fascists are spreading anti-British, anti-Soviet, anti-French, and anti-United Nations propaganda.

Is it the purpose of the War Department to stifle criticism, to do away with

free speech, to deny to all of us the right to criticize the activity of any other country or nation? Is the War Department campaigning for Dumbarton Oaks with Federal funds?

If memory serves me correctly I have heard gentlemen on the other side who say they are liberals, who are behind much of the proposed legislation, criticize other Governments' foreign policies. I will not name the gentlemen. Are they Fascists, too, or is it just those on this side or those in this House who venture to believe that our sovereignty in this San Francisco Conference should not be surrendered against whom this blast was put out?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman find anything in that article that in any way implies anything against any Member of the House? They are only warning our armed forces against Fascist activities abroad and there is nothing in it against any Member of this House as I read it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The viciousness of it is that it picks out the names of men whose sons are fighting and dying in this war and brands them as American Fascists. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] puts that statement in the RECORD when he knows they cannot come here and defend themselves.

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about the article to which he refers that the gentleman from Illinois put in the RECORD the other day.

Mr. SABATH. That does not appear in the article.

Mr. RANKIN. The names of these men, who are just as patriotic as the gentleman from Illinois, are included in that statement the gentleman from Illinois inserted in the RECORD the other day.

Mr. SABATH. That does not appear in the article.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; the names appear in the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. That is my own statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not just now.

If I read this article from the War Department correctly and the test laid down there, I doubt if there is a Member of this House who has not some characteristics of a Fascist, if the test be taken as accurate which of course it is not, because we have all criticized this, that and the other move at some time. The whole purport of the articles in *In Fact* is that if you are anti-New Deal then you are a Fascist. The gentleman from Illinois, after putting the War Department statement in the RECORD, went on to say:

Mr. Speaker, my only regret is that the rules and regulations of the War Department preclude the naming of outstanding American Fascists, such as the duPonts, the Fews, the Girdlers, the Welts—

And so forth. I say that the gentlemen just named are not Fascists, they are not Communists, they are Americans. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois does not know an American when he sees one.

If the gentleman from Illinois has any evidence that the individuals named are Fascists, and if fascism runs counter to true Americanism, and the holding of that belief is unpatriotic, he should take it to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I challenge him to make good his statement or withdraw it.

I confess that I have tried in vain to find out what a Fascist really is, unless it be said that he is just a member of a party which does not agree with your policies. If the gentleman has the evidence, why does he not take it to the House Standing Committee on Un-American Activities? Why make a blanket charge? The only reason I know of is that it may be they are Republicans and no specific charge can be substantiated.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will examine that article he will see that there is no charge of their being unpatriotic or that they are against the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman mean then?

Mr. SABATH. I shall enlighten the gentleman and, for the general information of the House, I shall define whom I consider to be a Fascist. American or native fascism is different from, although it has some characteristics of, the European brand of fascism. American or native fascism does not indicate loyalty to Hitler, Mussolini, or Hirohito, but rather it is a brand of political and economic philosophy which would subvert our democracy to the domination of a chosen few over the heritage of all Americans who have made their contributions to America regardless of race, creed, or color. Those who are striving to gain control for a privileged few—whether they are the descendants of the *Mayflower*, or so-called Anglo-Saxon whites, or economic Tories—can be described as Fascists in America. Those are the principles which have guided the Liberty Leaguers and the American Firsters who prevented America from seeing the dangers of European fascism and preparing for this war until they were sure their interests were safeguarded and protected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not true that the New Deal throughout its entire term has tended to put the Government in the hands of a few? Did not the late President say in his annual message of January 3, 1936:

In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.



Now, after 34 months of work, we contemplate a fairly rounded whole. We have returned the control of the Federal Government to the city of Washington.

And today the O. P. A., the W. P. B., N. L. R. B., and other Executive agencies are oppressing the people through the power they have acquired.

Mr. SABATH. We did not do anything against these men of affairs; in fact, they have been well treated by the New Deal, even by those who have been charged continuously with being Communists. I cannot understand why there is so much hullabaloo when the gentleman knows that everybody who at any time said anything for the New Deal was immediately classified by the very people whom I have designated, or by their representatives, of being Communists, and so forth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I regret the gentleman is not stating the facts.

Mr. SABATH. They like to give it but they do not like to take it.

The SPEAKER. This is getting to be a debate and not a question of personal privilege. The Chair would like to have the gentleman from Michigan confine himself to the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to do so. The charge was that there was a bloc of Fascists in America and that I was one of them.

The SPEAKER. I do not think any Member of the House will argue with the gentleman and try to prove that the article in question is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not know.

The SPEAKER. We have a heavy program in the House this week and the Chair trusts the gentleman will proceed with as small an amount of yielding as possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I could finish very quickly, Mr. Speaker, but I like to be courteous to the other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. But that is not the matter the Chair recognized the gentleman to speak about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, that is due to my ignorance then if I made a mistake in yielding.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman is going to speak on this question on which I received permission on a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. I understand that the article of which the gentleman complains specifically accuses the gentleman from Michigan with being a native American Fascist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. And in a subsequent article in the same paper to which the gentleman refers another distinguished Member of the House was specifically referred to as being a Fascist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. In that connection, the article placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois names certain other people of the country as being Fascists and gives the impression to the people of the country that the War Department designates them as American Fascists but due to

Army regulations is not permitted to name them publicly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the understanding.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the gentleman not get that impression from reading that article?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the logical inference to be drawn from that insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that at a proper time some day this week I shall perhaps have some comment to make upon that article submitted by the gentleman from Chicago.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will have to decline to yield under the ruling of the Chair.

The leaflet to which I have referred and as to which personal privilege was obtained, refers to those charged by the author with being opposed to so-called anti-discrimination legislation. Specifically H. R. 2232. I am opposed to the 2232 bill which I hope the Committee on Rules will shortly send up for action on the floor of the House, and I think that the reasons why I oppose that bill do not make me subject to any such charge as is contained in that article. We know what the 2232 bill purports to do. It is to end discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, before the gentleman gets away from this individual, George Seldes, I wish to call attention to the fact that the record of the Dies committee shows that this George Seldes was connected with several subversive front organizations; in other words organizations engaged in those activities calculated to overthrow and destroy this government. I am not giving you my guess. I am giving you the record of the Dies committee that investigated these matters.

Mr. SABATH. If that is so, they ought to be prosecuted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may we have order?

Mr. RANKIN. Then the gentleman from Illinois ought not to be vouching for him as an authority.

Mr. SABATH. I do not vouch for him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order and so is the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

#### LOOKING FOR TROUBLE

Mr. HOFFMAN. The avowed purpose of H. R. 2232 is to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. The objective is a desirable one. But the legislation proposed, in its implications, is broader than the announced purpose, is unsound and unworkable.

Briefly, the bill provides for the creation of a commission with the powers of an investigator, a prosecutor, a court, with authority to compel employers to hire applicants for jobs, labor unions to accept applicants for membership, without taking into consideration the applicant's race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

Some specific provisions of the bill will be referred to hereafter.

#### THE MEASURE IS UNSOUND

Attempts to change long-established habits or procedure—social reforms—which are based upon a state of mind, can be successful only when brought about by a disclosure of the facts; a persuasive appeal to a sense of justice and to reason.

Inherent beliefs, the faith of a people or a race, the customs, based upon experience and which have been adhered to for years and found by a majority opinion to be good, cannot be eradicated by legislation, although a people, a race, may be exterminated.

Ample proof of this fact is found in history.

The Good Book tells us that, on one occasion, the people, being of one language and of one speech, and we have no evidence of any discrimination at that time because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, sought to erect a tower reaching into the heavens—the Tower of Babel—but the Lord in His wisdom, to prevent it, created a confusion of tongues. The people of the world ever since have been divided into various races, colors, and creeds.

Do some now think that all the people of the world can once more, by prohibiting discrimination, be united into one race, one creed, of one color, with one language?

Whatever may have been the Lord's purpose or the present purpose of individuals or groups, experience teaches us that, so long as the laws of nature operate, the transition, if it ever occurs, will be long in coming.

The Pharaohs sought for years to hold the children of Israel in bondage, to change their religious faith. In the end, they but succeeded in uniting them; then scattering them throughout the world, where, down through the centuries, because of their racial characteristics, they have exerted in every line of human endeavor an influence out of all proportion to their number.

The all-powerful Roman Empire persecuted the Christians, threw them to the wild beasts, but Christianity still lives and has become the foundation of the greatest, the most powerful Nation in all the world—the United States of America.

Our own Nation, a nation of law-abiding people, tried prohibition—an attempt to bring about a social reform by force of law. The result was a dismal failure and the repeal of the constitutional amendment.

True, laws are needed and in many instances are a remedy for unfair and unjust acts practiced against individuals, but laws which have been effective are only those which have given a legal remedy against unjust, injurious acts which met with the disapproval of at least a majority of our people.

Other laws, designed to correct abuses and which were not supported by the judgment of the people, have either been repealed or ignored.

In orderly, civilized society, every individual must sacrifice some portion of his right, of his liberty, of his independence, for the good of all. No individual can

claim the full measure of freedom to which he is in the abstract entitled.

A partial surrender of the individual's freedom of action is the basis of civilized society, which analyzed, consists of the laws, rules, and customs conceived and tolerated by the majority for the good of the whole.

While all may be born to, and should have, equality of opportunity, self-preservation, greed, ambition, and sometimes even less worthy motives, destroy the pattern, and no method has been yet devised to successfully mold all individuals into one pattern.

It would be a dreary old world in which all looked alike, acted alike, spoke the same language, had the same desires.

#### THE BILL'S SPONSORS

Good citizens, sincere in their convictions, desiring to see all individuals of all races, creeds, and colors in possession of jobs, homes, and as well educated and financially established as are others who possess superior advantages, believe this legislation will do for those who, they say, are the victims of discrimination, what others think can be accomplished only by time and education.

Others, professional reformers, without convictions of any kind, see in the bill an opportunity to reap a rich financial reward through the exercise of their professional talents as creators of unrest and the advocacy of controversial legislation.

Still others supporting the bill are so-called "smart" politicians, who think that the holding out before the Negro, not only of the justifiable hope of equal opportunity for employment, but the vision of an immediate utopia, where all men will share equally in jobs, goods, and prosperity, will secure for them and their political party the support of the Negro voter.

It is for each Member of Congress, who desires to speak for, in support of, and to vote for this bill, to determine for himself in which, if any, of the categories enumerated above he should classify himself, or, if he prefers some other classification, to, if he wishes, designate and describe it.

#### SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

While the bill, by its terms, seeks merely to prohibit discrimination in employment, the hearings show that its supporters and advocates seek to extend the prohibition to broader fields.

It is evident from the hearings and from current arguments in support of the bill, that there is the additional desire and purpose to prohibit discrimination in social intercourse, in education, in business, as well as in employment.

In brief, the ultimate objective of some of those back of this measure is to place all individuals on an equal footing in every walk of life.

While the bill does not go that far, it is nevertheless contended and urged by some of those advocating its passage that there shall be no discrimination, not only in employment, because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry, but that every individual shall have equal opportunity to participate with

others, regardless of their wishes, in business, in social activities, in religious worship, and that a universal intermingling and, some assert, intermarriage of the races, regardless of creed or color, is desirable.

Given the most favorable possible construction, this proposed legislation is an attempt to force the individuals of all races, colors and faiths, regardless of their own desires, into every activity—social, economic and religious—on a basis of equality.

It appears to be the ultimate desire of some of the proponents of this legislation to permit individuals, no matter what their race, color, creed, or, for that matter, degree of education, prosperity or intelligence, to force Americans, and, speaking figuratively, to throw them into one huge melting pot—America—in the hope that out of the mixture will perhaps come a race of supermen, all showing the imprint of one mold.

Construed from a realistic standpoint, it will at the present time, in the opinion of many, emphasize racial feeling, incite civil strife and assist the Communists, who deny the existence of a deity and the efficacy of religion, in their efforts to create here a situation of which either a mob or a dictator may take advantage and use for the destruction of orderly constitutional government.

Accepting the view of some of its bitterest opponents, this legislation will better the condition of a few; impair the welfare of all others; create a mongrel race; destroy our government, which, from the time it came into existence until recently, was the fountain head of liberty, justice and opportunity for the peoples of the world.

In making the foregoing statements, I am not expressing my own views, merely giving voice to the hope of those who advocate, the fears of those who oppose, this bill. This is merely an attempt to recite some of the facts, give voice to some events certain to follow the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of this bill. Permit me to suggest that every Member of the Congress examine the bill in the light of present-day conditions, draw his own conclusions, act in accordance with his own judgment as to what will be best for the country, rather than what may be best for his own or his party's immediate political future.

#### THE NEED

The bill is founded upon the assumption that there is in this country substantial discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, which is detrimental to our national life.

The facts do not show discrimination in employment because of religion.

The census of 1936, the latest religious census, shows that in this country there are—

Protestants and all others, exclusive of Catholics and Jews, but including members of the Baha'is Society and the Vedanta Society, numbering—	31,251,245
Roman Catholics numbering—	19,914,937
Jews (members of Jewish congregations) —————	4,641,184

I challenge any Member of Congress or any advocate of this bill to point to any substantial discrimination, either in

public or private employment, against any individual because of his religious belief.

It is true that in certain cities, in certain sections of the country, people of one race or color are grouped together and that people of another race or color are not welcomed to that locality.

There are places where Irish, Italians, Germans, Hollanders, Scandinavians, Poles, or people of some other race are in the majority; but that grouping is not due to ill feeling against people of another race or color, but rather to the fact that the individuals in that community have certain national characteristics in common, and they naturally prefer as their neighbors people possessing the same general traits of character, using the same methods, having the same habits and customs.

It is more than possible that a typical fighting Irishman would find little to attract him in a community of Quakers, or that his arrival as a permanent resident there would be hilariously welcomed.

He who believes that racial characteristics which have been inbred in a people for centuries can be either suppressed or eradicated by legislation has more faith in the effectiveness of law than is justified by experience.

The average Irishman is not a merchant. He takes naturally to an environment which gives opportunity for physical activity, for political advancement. Jews are not, as a rule, workers in industrial factories, although they are largely engaged in the manufacture of clothing. They go in for merchandising and the professions.

Certainly the advocates of this bill do not contend that there is discrimination against the Jews in private enterprise or public office because of their race or creed. It is a well-known fact that many of the most powerful financial institutions in this country are controlled by the Jews. It is indisputable that their power, influence, and control over merchandising, the press, and the radio is out of all proportion to their number in the total population. In the professions, in the Federal Government, the Jews are predominant.

It would be interesting to those of us who have listened so long, so often, and so patiently to the stories by the Members of that race in this House of the persecution of the Jews to have accurate figures showing the proportion of the volume of the business of the country which is owned or controlled by individuals of the Jewish race; to know the exact number of Jews who are outstanding in the professions, in the sciences, in the arts; the number of high positions in the Federal Government held by or which are under the control of the members of that race.

Living in a small country town in a district where there are a considerable number of Jews, it was not until I came to Congress in 1935 and listened to some of the Members speak from the well of the House, read some of the propaganda distributed or broadcast over the radio by extremists, that I was advised that there was in this country any considerable racial feeling of any kind, or that individuals or organizations were antag-



onistic toward each other because of religious belief. I have yet to see any evidence that such discrimination or antagonism exists except perhaps in a few cities, and there it affects but a small proportion of the total population.

No one would seriously argue that the Catholic Church is lacking in influence or that individuals of that faith do not have a substantial, powerful role in the policies of our Government. The holdings of the Catholic Church, its schools, its colleges, and its universities, which dot our land from coast to coast, from Canada to Mexico, are proof that there is no discrimination against Catholics because of their creed.

Nor have I ever heard of any complaint by or from any Catholic that discrimination was practiced against him, either in private or public life, because of his faith.

The Catholic Church, so far as I know, is not asking for the adoption of this bill.

In number, the Protestants exceed any other religious group and, as a rule, one may search in vain for discrimination against them. Nor are they, as a group, seeking the adoption of this bill.

Other minority groups in this country, such as the Chinese, the Japanese, the Mexicans, are so few in number that legislation of this broad general character, so fraught with possibilities of creating ill feeling, is unnecessary.

Who, then, will be benefited by this bill? What race, what color, what people will be relieved of discrimination, if there is harmful discrimination in employment?

The legislation is based, and the hearings have proceeded, upon the assumption that members of the colored race, when they sought employment, were discriminated against by labor unions and employers.

It will be something of a shock to the outspoken advocates of this bill to be forced to acknowledge the fact that at least as to the number of jobs held by Negroes, the only discrimination practiced in employment has been in favor of—not against—the Negro.

There are no figures in the Bureau of the Census from which we can learn whether discrimination against Negroes has been practiced by labor unions or by the Federal Government. A casual survey of the Federal offices in Washington would lead one to the conclusion that Negroes are holding at least their due proportion of Federal jobs.

According to the census of 1940, there are in this country, 118,214,870 whites; 12,865,518 Negroes; 588,887 people of other races.

Individuals of the Negro race constitute 9.77 percent of the total population; they hold 9.91 percent of the jobs.

Figures from the same department for the year 1940 show that the total number of persons gainfully employed is 45,166,083; and that of this number 40,495,089 are white; 4,479,068 are Negroes, who hold 9.91 percent of the jobs, or fourteen one-hundredths of 1 percent more than they would be entitled to hold if employment was distributed upon a proportionate numerical basis.

It is a well-known fact that discrimination in some occupations or profes-

sions is practiced in favor of the Negro. In the steel mills, in the foundries, in some jobs where skill and endurance under heat is required, the Negro, because physically better adapted to and qualified for that work, receives a preference. Negroes are favored as cooks, chefs, waiters, chauffeurs, and many other occupations for which they are especially qualified.

The Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Division of Review and Analysis, made a report in January of 1945, in which it was stated—page 3—that, from the statistics submitted by 44 agencies of the Government as of July 31, 1943, 12.5 percent of the employees were Negroes; from the statistics furnished by 30 independent agencies, it appeared that, within that group, "Negroes formed 13.6 percent of the total employment."

The same report, on page 28, carries the information that, in the executive branch of the Government, there were employed as of March 31, 1944, 2,295,614 individuals, of whom 11.9 percent were Negroes.

The Negro population is but 9.77 percent of the whole.

Any discrimination shown by this report appears, on a casual reading, to be due to the fact that most of the jobs held by Negroes are in the lower brackets, as measured by compensation or educational qualifications; and it may be that, if there be disparity, it occurs because a higher, more technical, standard of education is necessary.

#### FEDERAL COMMISSION NOT THE ANSWER

If it be assumed that there is discrimination in employment which should be prohibited by legislation, this bill creating a Federal commission is not the answer.

If the usual pattern is followed—and there is no reason to believe it will not be—a majority of the individuals who now exercise the functions of the executive agency will be continued in power.

Some light as to the procedure and the results which may be expected if this bill becomes law will be gained by an examination of the present committee's activities.

The President's Fair Employment Practice Committee was first established on June 25, 1941. The United States Government Manual tells us that the committee was created to do just two things—and I quote—"to promote the fullest utilization of all available manpower and to eliminate discriminatory employment practices."

The hearings do not disclose that either the hearings or the orders of the committee have utilized additional manpower.

The committee, whose principal duty it was to eliminate discriminatory employment practices, has, if its acts are any proof of its purpose, itself been guilty of the most flagrant discrimination in favor of a minority group.

It has considered complaints, held hearings and issued orders against others, but it has not itself, in its own activities, frowned upon discrimination.

In fact, this particular agency, like so many minority groups when once they get power, has used its power to advance

the interests of its own followers, to discriminate against all others, even though the group to which they belong be in the majority.

From a statement furnished by the F. E. P. C. itself on March 8, 1945, we get the following figures:

The total number of employees of the F. E. P. C. is 110. They are divided as follows:

	Number of employees	Percentage of total number <sup>1</sup>	Salaries	Percentage of salaries <sup>1</sup>
White.....	43	39.1	\$150,180	43.13
Colored.....	65	59	194,580	55.88
Japanese-American.	2	1.9	3,420	.99
Total.....	110	100.0	348,180	100.00

<sup>1</sup>Not computed by Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

From the foregoing, it appears that, although, of the total population of the United States, 89.78 percent are whites and but 9.77 percent Negroes, when this agency, created to prevent discrimination, transacts its own business, it discriminates against the whites of all races, of all faiths, and gives to the Negroes 59 percent of the jobs, although, on the basis of population, they constitute but 9.77 percent of the population.

The F. E. P. C. itself; that executive agency of which we have heard so much; whose officials are so insistent that they be given the cloak of legal authority; that the agency be made permanent, clothed with the power to receive, investigate, hear and judge complaints; that its employees be clothed with the authority of a sheriff, a prosecutor and a judge, by its own record is shown to be biased, prejudiced and a creator of racial feeling and discrimination.

It pays the Negroes in its employ 55.88 percent of the total funds expended by it for employment, although the Negroes number but 9.77 percent of the total population.

Japanese-Americans in the employ of the committee number but two. Their compensation totals \$3,420.

An agency so biased and so unfair is incapable of administering equal justice under law and should be abolished, instead of being given legal authority, entrusted with arbitrary power.

We have no reason to believe that any legalized successor of the present committee would do a better job. We have but to recall some of the orders and directives, some of the procedures of the O. P. A., of the W. P. B., of the N. L. R. B., whose rules and procedure it is proposed this new commission shall follow, to realize how unmindful of the rights of citizens and businesses, how arbitrary, unreasonable and tyrannical, are some Government agencies.

#### A FEW POSSIBLE RESULTS OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Because, if he would live, man must have food, clothing, and shelter, unless he can obtain these by gift, through charity, or by theft, he must work. From this premise it is argued that the individual must be given a job, has a property right

to a job. Some proponents of this measure advance the theory that if A has no means of livelihood, B, who is more fortunate, must furnish a job for him.

If it be true that A is entitled to a job, can it not be urged, with equal force, that if B purchases a tract of land, clears it and, through foresight, hard work, and thrift, creates 10 jobs, those jobs are B's jobs to be given to whosoever he may choose for the work? That he should have the right, if he prefers, being himself a Catholic, a Jew, or a Protestant, to surround himself with people of his own faith, deny a job to one of another faith?

If an individual engaged in merchandising, or in manufacturing, because of the exercise of his own talents, finds that he can employ more than 6 people, should he not have the right to employ the needed assistance, without being forced to accept people of a faith or creed which he abhors? When a man creates a job, does it belong to him or to an applicant? He can close his factory, sell his dairy herd, abandon his farm—he can end all jobs at his disposal—destroy them all by ending his enterprise—can he not then base his refusal to give one to an applicant on the ground that the applicant is a Mohammedan or a Jap or German?

Suppose the employer's son was one of those tortured to death by a Jap or German and the sight of, or association with, either causes grief, brings back his loss, must he be forced to disregard the man's race and hire him—have ever before him a reminder of his son's suffering and death?

If a Jewish synagogue, a Catholic cathedral, or a Protestant church needed janitors, painters, anyone to do a job, and individuals of another faith applied, should the organization be compelled to disregard creed when hiring an employee? And don't tell me that bill does not apply because they are not engaged in an activity which affects interstate commerce—not since the courts decided that the man who sells coal for burning within a State to a company which uses it within the State to make electricity which sheds its light across a State line, is engaged in a business affecting interstate commerce.

And do not the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant religious organizations, employing more than six workers, publish and circulate their publications in interstate commerce? Of course, they do.

Assume that the operator of a foundry, having found by experience that only workers of the colored race could stand the heat, the difficult working conditions, needed 50 men; if he inserted an ad in a trade paper asking for Negro workers, he would, if a previous ruling of one of the employees of the present committee be followed, be held guilty of a violation of this proposed legislation, nor would he have the right, if this bill became law, to refuse to hire a white man, even though the white man could not do the job.

If the owner and operator of a cold-storage plant, where hundreds of carcasses of beef were hung and removed each week, knowing by experience that members of the Negro race were susceptible to the cold, unsuited to his purpose, announced that he would hire only whites and would prefer Norwegians and Swedes

from Minnesota or some other northern locality, he would fall under the ban of the proposed commission. Would you say the refusal would not be based upon the fact that the applicant belonged to one race or the other, but was because he was not physically qualified for the job? That, of course, would be the real reason, but, believe it or not, all too frequently Government agencies base their findings upon other than the real reason.

One has but to read the decisions and the testimony in cases decided by the N. L. R. B. to learn that over a period of months—yes; of years—the real reason for an order was buried beneath a load of sophistry and the case decided upon the announced reason that the employer had acted because of union activities.

Just read the Supreme Court decision of a week ago. In one case the court held—if I read the decision correctly—that a rule made to prevent the littering of company premises and the wasting of time by employees and which prevented the soliciting of union memberships during working hours on company property was invalid because it interfered with the right of the employees to organize.

Did Congress, when it gave the right of collective bargaining, have any thought that union organizers, when not working for the company, could go upon the company's premises during working hours and interfere with production by soliciting members? Yet today that is the rule.

Suppose a Congressman wants an additional clerk, he already having six employees. It happens that he is a gentleman and the gentlemen prefer blondes, but a beautiful French brunette shows up. The Congressman maybe wants a Swede, but surely, his speeches going into and sometimes burdening interstate commerce, if this bill becomes law he will take the French secretary, even though his good wife has an aversion, a deep, abiding aversion, to brunettes, and thinks blondes capable and harmless.

Oh, the legislation is filled not only with absurd possibilities but probabilities capable of arousing discord and strife, being used for persecution and racketeering.

If there is no reason why a white Catholic should be permitted to deny employment to a Negro Protestant, is there any reason why a white Protestant, other things being equal, should not be required to work for a colored Catholic?

One familiar with the record will recall that, under the N. L. R. A., in all too many instances when a complaint was made against an employer, and it was alleged that the discharge or refusal to hire was made because of union affiliations or activities, the employer was found guilty of an unfair labor practice, in some cases ordered to pay back wages, though there was ample evidence to show that the discharge was due to a violation of a company rule made for the protection of the employee, or because of the applicant's criminal record.

If this bill becomes law and an individual applies for a job which is not forthcoming and another applicant is selected, how easy it will be to file a

charge that employment was denied because of race, creed, color, or ancestry, and how easy will it be for a board set up to protect the interest of minority groups to find, as a matter of fact—that is, in its own opinion—that the refusal was due to discrimination.

On the 27th, the chairman of the Labor Committee put into the RECORD, page A2123, certain questions relating to this bill, which she then proceeded to answer. Incidentally, that is a very convenient and effective way to convey a lot of misinformation.

At this point let me answer just one of the questions she asked herself and then answered:

16. Question. Will the bill make possible racketeering, blackmail, or groundless suits?

Answer. No; because the F. E. P. C. will dismiss all groundless charges on its own initiative, without formal proceedings and before there is any contact with the accused employer. The present F. E. P. C. has dismissed two-thirds of all the complaints filed with it. F. E. P. C. thus serves as a necessary safety valve for people who fancy they were discriminated against.

That part of the answer which tells us that the bill will not make possible racketeering, blackmail, or groundless suits, and I quote:

Because the F. E. P. C. will dismiss all groundless charges on its own initiative, without formal proceedings and before there is any contact with the accused employer—

rests upon the assumption that we are dumb. If it were true that an unfounded complaint would be dismissed without notifying the defendant, that does not do away with the opportunity created by the bill to make charges of discrimination.

And just how will F. E. P. C. determine "on its own initiative, without formal proceedings and before there is any contact with the accused employer" that a charge is groundless? What sort of an investigation will it make to arrive at such a conclusion? Is anyone so simple-minded as to believe that anyone engaged in an effort to collect blackmail, operating a racket, would present to the F. E. P. C. a charge that was groundless on its face? Racketeers are too smart, too unscrupulous to follow that course.

I personally know of one case where, under an O. P. A. regulation fixing the price on coal, a dealer was required to produce his books showing his charges, giving the names of his customers and, when it appeared that to meet the teamsters' demand for a 50-cent increase he had raised the price of coal, someone with access to the file took that list of customers and wrote each of them that he was entitled to a minimum penalty—I think it was \$25 or \$50. What an opportunity for a crooked shyster, grafting lawyer! How easy, if this bill becomes law, for a smart lawyer to collect 10 expert stenographers, clerks, or individuals of any particular calling, of each race and religious faith, then watch the employment ads and shove in his stooges as an applicant for a job where he knows that notwithstanding the qualifications, for one reason or another, the job would be refused, then lay back and after 6 months or a year make complaint and obtain from a friendly board an order



to hire, plus 6 months' or a year's back pay.

That the advocates of this bill are not solely concerned with lessening discrimination is shown by the fact that it does not attempt to prevent discrimination in employment because of nonmembership in some labor organization.

It is a matter of common knowledge that labor organizations have practiced discrimination against the members of other unions and this though at times the applicants were affiliates of the same international.

The New Deal administration has practiced wholesale discrimination in favor of the C. I. O. The C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the administration time and again joined to discriminate against the non-union worker.

When the construction of Army camps, barracks, and war plants, was vitally needed, hundreds of thousands of men were either deprived of employment or made to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars tribute before being permitted to work on the sole ground that they were not members of a specified union.

Today many a blood relative of a man who is on the fighting front cannot work to produce the munitions of war needed by the son, brother, or husband, until the demands of a union have been met—discrimination which denies a man's right to earn a livelihood.

In last week's issue of Collier's, John L. Lewis points to the fact that while there are 55,000,000 workers in the United States, but 15,000,000 of them are members of a union. There are 40,000,000 wage earners who are not members of a union, and against them discrimination is practiced by unions, employers, and the Federal Government. But the sponsors of this bill and the chairman of the Labor Committee, the Representative from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] forgot to make any provision to end discrimination against nonunion workers, even though they may be veterans of the World War.

Something more than a desire to give an equality of employment is back of this bill. As to just what it is, each Member of this body is at liberty to draw his own conclusions.

Like the N. L. R. A. this bill would penalize employers. It makes no provision to penalize an employee. If an employer is compelled to accept an applicant for a job without giving consideration to the applicant's race, creed, color, or ancestry, should not the converse be true? Should an individual who has no job, who must work if he would live, be required to accept a job without giving consideration to the race, creed, color, or ancestry of the would-be employer?

This proposed legislation, like the N. L. R. A., is a one-way device, giving special privileges to one group, penalizing another; but it is not permitted to work in reverse.

As experience has demonstrated, the N. L. R. A. must some day be amended so as to place upon unions a degree of responsibility commensurate with the power given them.

So, too, this bill, if it ever becomes law, must, before it will lessen strife, assist in doing away with racial and religious feel-

ing, do justice as between employer and employee; place equal responsibility; give equal rights to both employer and employee, union and nonunion workers.

#### AN UNREASONABLE GRANT OF ARBITRARY POWER

Even a casual reading and consideration of the bill will disclose the opportunity for discrimination and oppression proposed to be given.

The bill proposes a grant of unreasonable and arbitrary power, limited in no way by the substantive and procedural safeguards which have been found to be necessary to protect the citizen in his property and person, in the exercise of his constitutional rights.

Under section 7 of the bill, the Commission has power to order any person or organization to desist from what the Commission considers any unfair employment practice; to order such individual to take any affirmative action, including the reinstatement or the hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will—and I quote—"effectuate the policies of this act."

It is section 9 (a) of the bill which would give the Commission and all of its agents—and do not forget that under the bill the Commission appoints its own agents—its snooping powers, which include the right to, without the restrictions imposed on courts which issue search warrants, search and examine the files of any person against whom any employee of the agency may have issued a complaint.

Not only that, but any member of the Commission is granted the power to issue a subpoena requiring any individual, no matter where he may reside, to appear before the Commission, any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission, at any place named by the Commission or any of its agents.

A resident of the northeastern corner of the State of Washington may be required, if this bill becomes a law, to appear before any agent of the Commission sitting in Miami, Fla.

If the person against whom a complaint has been filed, or any of his employees, or any other individual, is wanted as a witness, and if he should happen to be, or to reside, in the Philippine Islands, he may, if it be summertime and the investigating agent of the F. E. P. C. be sojourning at a summer resort in Maine, be required, not only to himself travel across the Pacific and the continent, but to bring with him any and all papers, books, and exhibits which the designated agent may think he may need.

If the absurdity of the foregoing statements make them untenable of belief, listen to this language, which I quote from subsection (d) of section 9:

(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

All this, insofar as the terms of the bill provide, at his own expense, except as the Commission may provide otherwise.

If the witness does not appear, then he may be taken before a court and punished for contempt.

Under section 9 (c), the Commission or any of its agents, or any agent designated by it, may investigate, examine witnesses, receive evidence.

All of the rules of evidence and procedure, which, down through the years, have been found by the English-speaking peoples to be necessary in judicial proceedings for the protection of the liberty and the property of the citizen, are thrown out the window and in their place by this bill are substituted the whims, caprices, the screw-ball ideas, of whoever at the moment may be clothed by the Commission with authority to hold a hearing.

The bill gives the Commission and the horde of agents who will be appointed by it—and there is no limit to the number—the authority "to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effect the purposes and policies of the act"; and, believe it or not, to make the results of such studies available to "nongovernmental agencies."

What a sweet opportunity is here given, if this bill becomes law, to this Commission to pry into the business of an individual or a corporation and give the results of its snooping to a competitor who may have the inclination and the money to pay for such information.

To put the binding keystone in the arch of its arbitrary power, the bill provides that the Commission shall have the authority to issue "such regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of the act."

The only way provided by this bill for the suspension or rescission of such regulations is the passage, within 60 days of the promulgation of such regulation, of a concurrent resolution of disapproval by the two Houses of Congress, expressly stating in substance that the Congress disapproves of the questioned regulation.

We are all aware that, if this bill becomes a law, many a regulation of the Commission, because of the lapse of the 60 days, will be beyond remedial action by Congress.

As a practical proposition, the inequity involved in many a regulation issued by Government agencies and commissions is undetected until after the expiration of more than 60 days from the date it was issued.

It will be noted in this connection that the bill provides the machinery for the effective suspension or abolition of all of the rules of evidence and procedure with which our courts are familiar and upon which the people of this country have come to rely for protection against injustice and oppression.

To make it doubly sure that no one will successfully attempt to interfere with any of the edicts issued by the Commission, section 13 states that a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, shall be imposed upon any person who shall "willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act."

Presumably, if an outraged citizen, unable to restrain his indignation because of some arbitrary or insolent treatment by a member of the Commission or one

of its many agents—and the Commission is given authority to appoint "such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions"—should use mule-skinner language or a sock on the jaw to express his resentment, he might be sent to jail for a year and fined \$5,000.

Instead of being arrested and tried and possibly convicted of an ordinary assault and battery, an assault and battery upon an agent of the Commission might become a felony, where, if committed upon the average citizen, it would be but a misdemeanor.

This bill by its provisions affords ample opportunity for the Commission to exercise discrimination against a majority of the citizens of the Nation.

#### JUDICIAL REVIEW

It is quite true that section 8, to the uninquiring, holds out the promise of judicial review to those—other than Government agencies—who might be subject to the orders of the Commission.

But the proposed judicial review is given—and I quote—"in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same provisions of law, as in the case of orders of the National Labor Relations Board."

Those familiar with the National Labor Relations Act, its interpretation and its enforcement by the National Labor Relations Board, are fully aware that the proposed "judicial review" is a farce.

Both the C. I. O. and the A. F. L.—yes, and the United Mine Workers under John L. Lewis—have portrayed the bias and the unfairness of the National Labor Relations Board in language which is not only understandable but picturesque and forceful. All three have bitterly, on one occasion or another, condemned it, its investigations and its decisions.

It might be well at this point to recall the procedure followed by the National Labor Relations Board. It was this:

When a labor dispute arose, the Board sent out an investigator. If he reported an unfair labor practice, a complaint was filed against the employer—never against the employee—by the Board. A trial examiner was sent out. Too often the trial examiner had little knowledge of law, no experience with legal procedure or industrial operations. Too often he was selected by the C. I. O. or its general counsel, Lee Pressman.

The examiner would take testimony. Of one such examiner, a United States circuit court of appeals said in January 1940: "His purpose was deliberately to discredit the testimony" of the employer's witnesses.

After the testimony was taken, it went to a reviewing attorney, who summarized the testimony and then presented to the Board his or her conclusions as to what the testimony showed. The Board then directed that reviewing attorney to prepare a decision, which the Board later adopted. If the employer did not like the decision, he could appeal to the circuit court of appeals, and those findings, under the act, "if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive."

Do you follow the procedure? The circuit court of appeals had to accept the findings of the Labor Board—and if

this Commission is created, its findings—whose practice it was to accept the findings of the reviewing attorney, which were all too often based upon unfair hearings by the trial examiner.

Here is the point: The whole superstructure—that is, the finding of the Board, the decision of the circuit court of appeals, the decision of the United States Supreme Court—rested upon the conclusions of the reviewing attorney, who had examined the transcript prepared by the trial examiner and had orally stated his—the reviewing attorney's—views of what the transcript showed to the Board.

And who was the reviewing attorney? I wish you could have seen some of those reviewing attorneys, some who worked upon cases like that of the Ford Motor Co. and others equally important, cases which involved the jobs and the livelihood of thousands.

From the testimony of the Smith committee, take these facts as to two of the reviewing attorneys:

Miss Margaret McDuff Farmer, appointed March 11, 1938; a graduate of Columbia; admitted to practice law March 14, 1938. In one case Miss Farmer wrote the decision for the Board—Sorg Paper Co., case No. R-633; reported in volume 8 of the Decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, page 657. Yet, when she was asked whether, in view of previous decisions, that decision was correct, she stated that she did not know.

Mrs. Ann Landy Wolf, then 29 years of age; born in Hungary; came to this country in 1929; took out her first papers in 1930; became a citizen in 1935; completed her course at the law school of Western Reserve University in 1937; appointed as a reviewing attorney on February 1, 1938. She received \$2,700 a year.

Mrs. Wolf was assigned to some 14 cases; on one, the Ford case, at St. Louis, another reviewing attorney had been assisting her. The record in that case comprised more than 21,000 pages.

It appeared from the record that, in the files of the case which she reviewed, there was an extremely prejudicial affidavit which was not a part of the record. There were other communications in the file which were not a part of the record. Yet there they were, and their influence was apparent in the decision.

Unless that practice is changed under this bill, any reviewing attorney can go before the Commission and orally express his opinion as to what the decision should be. Then the Commission will indicate its opinion, based on what it has been told, and, on appeal, the circuit court of appeals will "swallow" that decision.

No criticism is here offered because those reviewing attorneys were women, or, more correctly speaking, young girls. Young men were doing the same kind of work, as were older examiners and reviewing attorneys, who had no qualifications for the jobs to which they had been assigned.

They were utterly without experience, either as an attorney, a judge, an industrial worker, or an employer. What could they or the young men possibly have known about the difficulties which confronted employers and employees in great industrial plants?

Nevertheless, those girls and those young men reached conclusions, gave the Labor Board findings, the result of which would make or break a great industrial enterprise; which might require that employer to pay thousands of dollars, or, as in Republic Steel, millions of dollars, in back pay to employees; which conclusions were later adopted by a circuit court of appeals. No doubt the judges who adopted some of those opinions would be hot with indignation if they discovered on what a flimsy foundation they had been basing some of their opinions.

The record of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, created by Executive order, is no better.

The procedure of administering so-called justice set up by this bill should be repudiated by a unanimous vote.

If there is discrimination which wrongs any individual, which causes him damage, then the remedy should be sought through recognized, established channels, which have demonstrated the ability to right a wrong, administer justice.

If the individual, cheated through fraud, overreached, injured, and damaged by the failure to respect his right, is required to appeal to the courts of the land for relief, so, too, the individual who may have just cause for complaint, after the enactment of this legislation, because of discrimination in employment, should be directed to the courts for relief.

If a man refuses to pay a just debt; if he carelessly and negligently injures another or his property, a complete and an adequate remedy is available in a court of justice.

Is there any reason why a favorably prejudiced agency should be created to administer justice between one who may claim, if this bill becomes a law, that discrimination in employment has been practiced against him, and the one whom he charges has injured him, while all others seeking a remedy for other wrongs should be required to avail themselves of court procedure?

If the prohibition of discrimination in employment be the sole, or even the principal objective of those who sponsor this bill, why practice discrimination in providing a remedy?

My only purpose in taking the floor—and it may seem egotistical, but is not so intended—is to call to the attention of the Members some of the results which may follow the adoption and the enforcement of this legislation.

When the issue arose before the Smith committee, some of those charged with the enforcement of the present executive-created agency appeared as witnesses, as did others who were deeply interested.

Again, when this bill came before the Labor Committee, testimony was taken, but unfortunately other duties prevented all but a few Members of Congress from either attending or reading carefully and at length the testimony taken before either committee.

It is my firm conviction that there are probabilities—to say nothing of possibilities—wrapped up in this legislation, which have not been considered by a majority of the Members of the House.



That statement is made, not because it is thought that any Member has neglected his duty but because we all know that it is impossible for every Member to be fully aware of even the terms of all proposed legislation.

Moreover, no one of us, intelligent and studious as he may be, can know in advance how any executive agency will interpret or administer any particular law we pass.

We were all rudely awakened to that fact when the Tydings amendment, contained in the Selective Service Act, was so grossly misapplied and agricultural workers, who, by the terms of that law, were exempt from induction, were drafted into the service on the orders of the Executive Department.

Nor should any member attempt to excuse his vote for or against this bill on the ground that it will never become a law.

When the bill was before one of the committees of which I am a member, a gentleman who asked me to vote to report it out of committee suggested that I should not be overly worried about it, for it would never come to the floor of the House, but remain buried in the Rules Committee.

Another gentleman of the House expressed the firm conviction that, while it would come out of the Rules Committee and pass the House by an overwhelming majority, it would be killed in the Senate.

If I understood these two gentlemen correctly, they lacked faith in the merit of the bill, but considered it good political strategy; first, the one to report it out of the House Labor Committee; the other to have it adopted by the House, even though it was killed in the Senate.

Some other Members of the House thought it might be a good plan, from a Republican standpoint, to pass the bill; put it up to President Truman, on the theory that he would veto it.

In my judgment, no question of expediency should cloud the issue. It is here, and here to stay until correctly decided.

If there be discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry, which seriously affects our national welfare, there is, in my humble judgment, an adequate remedy available which will not do violence to vital, constitutional procedure which has been found to be necessary for the protection of all citizens.

#### THERE IS A REMEDY

It was at Runnymede in 1215, where, after long years of oppression, the people wrested from King John the great charter which guaranteed to the individual security of person and property, a trial by jury, the judgment of his peers. It was there that the black night of tyranny was dispelled by the light of liberty.

The people so appreciated and were so jealous of the power wrested from King John that, when our Constitution was written they granted to the Federal Government only certain specified powers, reserving to themselves, to the people, all other power.

From that day down to the coming of the New Deal we have been secure in the

exercise of our freedom, in our property, because, under our Constitution and the Bill of Rights, there was available to each of us courts of justice, where our complaints were formulated by those learned in the law for presentation and hearing, where evidence might be heard, the accused be confronted by those who appeared against him, and his guilt or innocence determined by a jury of his peers.

The history of the world has never disclosed a system of administering justice so fair, so speedy, so efficient.

Nevertheless, since the coming of the New Deal, for a government by law, its interpretation by the courts, its enforcement by the executive department, we have substituted a government by men, who legislate through rules, directives, and regulations; interpret their own promulgations, and then, by a gigantic conspiracy among governmental agencies, enforce their interpretations by sanctions, imposing penalties, withholding privileges—yes, and rights—so that the citizen, although he may be entitled to have the order of one department set aside by the courts, because it was issued without authority or exceeds the authority of the issuing agency, is afraid to appeal to the court because he knows that another agency will put him out of business if he makes the attempt.

Lack of time forbids a citation of examples of this policy, but every Member of this body who has been forced to deal to any extent with Government agencies recognizes the truth of the statement.

Here is an opportunity to repudiate that policy and to begin to retrace our steps along the paths which will lead to constitutional government, to the return of government under the Constitution.

If it be urged that political expediency requires Republicans to support this bill because our national platform endorsed antidiscrimination legislation and our Presidential candidate has since procured the enactment of such legislation in the State of New York, it may with equal force and propriety be suggested that in 1932 the Democratic Party pledged itself to a drastic reduction in the number of governmental bureaus, agencies, and employees, but that ever since it has increased the number of Federal agencies, bureaus, commissions, and employees.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Republican Party has long advocated economy and that it has time and again declared against an increase in governmental agencies.

If the national party platform adopted at Chicago constrains Republicans to vote for the bill because this is antidiscrimination legislation, let it not be forgotten that it also pledges us to vote against this bill because it creates a new commission, violates our promise to practice economy.

Moreover, a party pledge, the keeping of which would work irreparable harm to our country as a whole, create an unwise, unworkable method of administering relief, should be promptly and unmistakably repudiated upon discovery of that fact.

If it be assumed that there is discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry, and that remedial legislation is needed, the violated right should be clearly defined by the Congress, the remedy pointed out and the judicial machinery created under the constitutional provisions, proven by time to be adequate to the equitable administration of justice under law, be employed.

To relieve Republicans of any embarrassment which they might otherwise suffer because of a fancied repudiation of a national party platform pledge to give a right of action to every individual injured by discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry, and to provide an adequate remedy for such wrong and to at the same time protect unions and employers from injustice and arbitrary action, H. R. 2495 was introduced and will be offered as a substitute for H. R. 2232 when that bill is brought to the floor.

That substitute provides that, if there be discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry, then the injured person shall have a right of action against the one who has wronged him and shall recover in a court of law adequate damages and costs, to be assessed by a jury chosen from the district where the wrong occurred.

That bill gives a full and an adequate remedy for any discrimination which might be unlawfully practiced after its enactment.

It places on an equal footing with every other citizen every individual against whom discrimination is practiced because of race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry.

It not only does everything that this bill can do in the way of giving adequate justice, but it will be a guarantee that, in the administration of the act, discrimination will not be practiced, either against or in favor of any individual because of any of the reasons named in the bill.

If one of the purposes of H. R. 2232 be to set up a new administrative agency; turn loose a regiment of snoopers; fan the fires of racial and religious bigotry; harass employers and unions; create civil strife, then H. R. 2495 is not the answer.

If the proponents of H. R. 2232 are sincere in their claim that there is discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, and if their sole purpose be to grant a remedy, H. R. 2495 is the answer. It contains but 30 lines, 274 words and figures, but it answers every legitimate claim for relief which has been urged by the proponents of H. R. 2232.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman print the bill at the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under the permission granted I will do so.

H. R. 2232

A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice act."

## FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds—

(1) that the practice of discriminating in the matter of employment, and in matters relating thereto, against properly qualified persons because of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry leads to domestic and industrial strife and unrest and forces large segments of the population permanently into substandard conditions of living, thereby creating a drain upon the resources of the Nation and a constant threat to the maintenance of industrial peace and of the standard of living necessary to the health, efficiency, and well-being of workers; and

(2) that the existence of such practices in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce causes the means and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such conditions throughout the several States and causes diminution of employment and wages in such volume as substantially to impair and disrupt the market for goods in commerce, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

(b) Individuals shall have the right to work without discrimination against them because of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to protect such right and to eliminate all such discriminations to the fullest extent permitted by the Constitution. This act shall be construed to effectuate such policy.

## DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, legal representative, trustee, trustee in bankruptcy, receiver, or any organized group of persons, and includes any agency or instrumentality of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof.

(b) The term "employer" means a person having in his employ six or more individuals, or any other person acting in the interest of such an employer, directly or indirectly.

(c) The term "labor union" means any organization, having six or more members, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, or terms or conditions of employment.

(d) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

(e) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(f) The term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission created by section 6.

## RIGHT TO FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 4. The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State.

## UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for the purposes of this Act for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any individual from employment because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(3) to discriminate against any individual in the matter of compensation with respect to, or in other terms or conditions of, employment because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry or

(4) to confine or limit recruitment or hiring of individuals for employment to any employment agency, placement service, training school or central labor union or organization, or any other source that discriminates against individuals because of their race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for the purposes of this act for any labor union—

(1) to deny full membership rights and privileges to any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to expel from membership any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

(3) to discriminate against any member, employer, employee, or individual seeking employment, because of his race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It shall be unfair employment practice for the purposes of this act for any employer or labor union to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because such person has opposed any practice which constitutes an unfair employment practice under this act or has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

## FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) For the purpose of securing enforcement of the foregoing rights and preventing unfair employment practices, there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in its employ or under its supervision, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed, and shall make such further reports on the cause of, and means of alleviating discrimination, and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 a year, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(f) When three members of the Commission have qualified and taken office, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall cease to exist. All employees of the said committee shall then be transferred to and become employees of the Commission, and all records, papers, and property of the committee shall then pass into the possession of the Commission.

(g) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

(h) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions;

(2) to cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents or agencies the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder; and

(5) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested Government and nongovernmental agencies.

## PREVENTION OF UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as provided in this section—

(1) to prevent unfair employment practices by employers affecting commerce;

(2) to prevent unfair employment practices by employers who are parties to contracts with the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, or with any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, and by employers performing, pursuant to subcontract or otherwise, any work required for the performance of any such contract;

(3) to prevent unfair employment practices by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and of the Territories and possessions thereof; and

(4) to prevent unfair employment practices by labor unions affecting commerce.

(b) Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed not less than 10 days after the serving of said complaint.

(c) The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to such complaint and to appear in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint.

(d) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back



pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

#### JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. Except as provided in section 12 (relating to the enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies), orders of the Commission shall be subject to judicial enforcement and judicial review in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same provisions of law, as in the case of orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

#### INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against relating to any such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(c) Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing; any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by it as a contempt thereof.

(f) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

#### RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 10. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue such regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and to amend or rescind, from time to time, any such regulation whenever it deems such amendment or rescission necessary to carry out the provi-

sions of this act. If, within 60 days after the issuance of any such regulation or of an amendment to any such regulation, there is passed a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that Congress disapproves such regulation or amendment, as the case may be, such regulation or amendment, as the case may be, shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution; and after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution, no regulation or amendment having the same effect as that concerning which the concurrent resolution was passed shall be issued by the Commission.

Regulations issued under this section shall include the procedure for service and amendment of complaints, for intervention in proceedings before the Commission, for the taking of testimony and its reduction to writing, for the modification of the findings or orders prior to the filing of records in court, for the service and return of process, the qualification and disqualification of members and employees and any other matters appropriate in the execution of the provisions of this act.

#### INCLUSION OF ANTIDISCRIMINATION CLAUSE IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 11. (a) Every contract to which the United States, or any Territory or possession thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, is a party (except such classes of contracts as the Commission may by regulation issued under section 10 exempt from the scope of this section) shall contain a provision under which—

(1) the contractor agrees that during the period required for the performance of the contract he will not engage in any unfair employment practices; and

(2) the contractor agrees that he will include a provision in each subcontract made by him for the performance of any work required for the performance of his contract a provision under which the subcontractor agrees—

(A) that during the period required for the performance of the subcontract, the subcontractor will not engage in any unfair employment practices; and

(B) that the subcontractor will include in each subcontract made by him provisions corresponding to those required in subparagraph (A) and this subparagraph.

(b) Unless the Commission shall otherwise direct, no contract shall be made by the United States, or any Territory or possession thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, with any person found pursuant to this act to have engaged in any unfair employment practice, or with any corporation, partnership, association, or other organization, in which such person owns a controlling interest, for a period (to be fixed by the Commission) not to exceed 1 year from the date on which such practice was so found to have been engaged in. The Commission may, by subsequent order, for good cause shown, reduce any period so fixed. The Comptroller General of the United States shall distribute to all agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and to the appropriate officials in the Territories and possessions of the United States, lists containing the names of such persons, corporations, partnerships, associations, and organizations.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 12. The provisions of section 8 (providing for judicial enforcement and judicial review of orders of the Commission) shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof. In the case of any such order, the Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to secure compliance with such order, which

may include the summary discharge of any officer or employee of any such agency or instrumentality who, in the opinion of the President or such person as the President may designate, has willfully failed to comply with such order.

#### WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

SEC. 13. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

#### SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of such act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

#### H. R. 2495

A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice Act."

#### SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, legal representative, trustee, trustee in bankruptcy, receiver, or any organized group of persons having in his employ six or more persons, and includes any agency or instrumentality of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof.

SEC. 3. It shall hereafter be unlawful for any person as herein defined to refuse to hire, or to discriminate against an individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

SEC. 4. Any person injured by the violation of the preceding section shall have the right to recover of any person violating said section all actual damages which are the proximate result of such discrimination in any United States district court of the district wherein the person discriminating or the individual discriminated against may be a resident and such damages shall include the actual, reasonable, and necessary costs of such action, including an attorney fee of not less than \$25 nor more than \$200, the amount thereof to be determined by a jury selected in the usual manner.

SEC. 5. The United States courts of the various districts and circuits are hereby given jurisdiction to try such actions, and the pleadings, procedure, and rules shall be the same as those followed by such courts in the trial of civil actions.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an order of the Supreme court of the State of Florida out of respect for the memory of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 145) providing for membership of the United States in the Food and

Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 145, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House previously agreed to by unanimous consent, debate is limited to 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and one-half by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration today House Joint Resolution 145, providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

This resolution comes to you with the unanimous endorsement of your Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I can and do assure you that this approval was given only after extensive hearings and examination by the full committee into the purpose and objective of the proposed legislation.

It can be stated, and I believe fully justified by the record of your Committee on Foreign Affairs, that for several years past, few, if any, measures have been reported from this committee without the unanimous support of the committee members.

There is, of course, no rule to this effect nor have we adopted any such fixed policy, but there seems to be a unanimity of view that all measures affecting our relations with foreign nations should have such unquestionable merit as to win unanimous approval of the purpose of the legislation. If a proposal measures up to this standard, it is usually a simple task to reach an agreement upon the form and wording of the legislation and upon the method to be provided in the act for the accomplishment of its purpose.

The resolution now under consideration has an objective worthy of the unanimous approval accorded it by your committee, and it is with all confidence in the merits of the proposal that we submit it for the approval of the Congress.

May I as briefly as possible explain the purposes of the resolution. In section 1, authority is given to the President to accept membership for the United States in the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, an organization not yet effected at the time of the hearings on the resolution, and perhaps not completely effected at the present moment. But at this time 20 nations, members of the United Nations, have subscribed to the plan for the undertaking and a complete organization is now assured.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Since our committee hearings one other nation, New Zealand, has joined, making 21.

Mr. KEE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Section 2 of the resolution authorizes the appropriation by Congress of a sum not exceeding \$625,000 for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the operating expenses of the organization for the first fiscal year, and further authorizes an annual appropriation thereafter of not to exceed \$1,250,000 for the payment of our proportionate share of operating expenses for each recurring year.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does that mean there is no time limit as to how many years we may continue to appropriate for this?

Mr. KEE. This is supposed to be a permanent institution.

Mr. BREHM. I know; and I am not opposed to that. But if we are going to obligate ourselves from now on, I want to know it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is simply an authorization. The Committee on Appropriations will have to make the appropriation.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to see a time limit on this—say 1 or 2 years—while we are experimenting with it. As I said before, I am not opposed to it, but I would like some time limit on it. If it then fulfills the hopes which we desire, we could continue it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. There is a time limit in this respect, that it provides that any country can at the end of 4 years withdraw.

Mr. BREHM. It does not say that in the resolution.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is in the constitution.

Mr. KEE. It is in the constitution of the organization.

Section 3, merely expresses the opinion of Congress in reference to the future of an organization established a number of years ago under the name of International Institute of Agriculture. This last-named organization was set up under a treaty between many nations of the world, of which treaty the United States was a signatory. The Organization had its permanent headquarters at Rome, Italy, and was generally known as the Rome Institute. I will presently speak further in reference to this organization and the tentative plans in respect to it.

Sections 4 and 5 of the resolution are merely protective clauses, designed to insure the United States against involvement in any further new or additional obligations because of its participation in the proposed Organization.

I have set forth as briefly as possible a section by section analysis of the resolution. Quite naturally, there is need for an explanation of the purposes and objectives of the proposed organization and for a convincing showing of the benefits, if any, to be derived to

the United States by reason of its membership therein.

In the first place, may I call the attention of the House to the various international organizations already established or in process of establishment, under auspices of the United Nations, each having for its object some vitally important part of the gigantic task of building a new post-war world.

Already we have, functioning now and soon to rapidly expand its activities, U. N. R. R. A., the great instrumentality of relief and rehabilitation, to which all free nations are contributing. We have seen, at Dumbarton Oaks, the foundation laid for a monumental structure of enduring peace, and this structure is now in course of erection at San Francisco. To this task of transmitting the hopes and prayers of free peoples everywhere into an enduring guaranty of security, all freedom-loving nations are also contributing. We have seen at Bretton Woods the plans drawn for a safe, sane, and equitable international exchange, banking, and monetary system, and the establishment of a great bank and gigantic fund drawn from the world's resources, not to serve this Nation alone but for service to all nations.

The truth of the old, old declaration "United we stand, divided we fall," has been driven into the very souls of men during the period of aggression, conflict, and peril out of which we are now slowly emerging. For the first time in the world's history, we have awakened to the necessity that free peoples unite in order to stay free. The passage of the pending resolution will merely mean one more bond of union in freedom's cause.

Out of the conference of delegates from the free nations of the world, held at Philadelphia in January 1942, came the United Nations, a union with a single cause. We are now witnessing the triumph of that cause.

Out of the meeting of representatives from the United Nations at Atlantic City came U. N. R. R. A., the organization charged with post-war world relief and rehabilitation.

Out of the meeting of representative delegates from free nations at Bretton Woods came the plans for world financial and economic security.

Out of the Conference at Dumbarton Oaks came the plan, now before the greater Conference at San Francisco, for a union of nations pledged to the maintenance of lasting peace.

Out of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, held at Hot Springs, Va., in May 1941, came the plan for the Food and Agriculture Organization, the subject matter of the pending resolution.

The organization is designed to serve the world's farmers, the tillers of the soil, the cattle grazers, the fishermen, the producers of food everywhere in every land and clime. As shown by your committee report, its aims in its field are identical with the broad economical objectives of the world organization proposed to be set up by the San Francisco Conference. While retaining its identity, and operating in its particular field, the Food and Agriculture organization will be an im-



portant part of the general international organization.

As I have stated, the establishment of the food and agriculture organization was recommended by the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs, Va. That Conference, composed of representatives from practically every free nation in the world, thoroughly canvassed the field of world production, distribution and consumption of food, and other agricultural products. The Conference thereupon recommended the creation of a permanent international organization in the field of food and agriculture. The Interim Commission of the Hot Springs Conference, on which each of 44 governments had a representative, was directed to prepare plans for such an organization. By August 1944, the Commission completed and submitted to the governments of the 44 nations a draft of proposed constitution for the permanent organization so recommended by the Conference.

So far, as we have previously shown, 20 nations have announced their approval of the constitution and signified their intention to become members of the Organization. These 20 nations are listed in your committee's report. The list may not be complete, as it is not only possible, but probable, that other nations have announced their acceptance since our last advices. The objectives of the Organization are broadly stated in the preamble to its constitution, as follows:

It proposes . . . to promote the common welfare by raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy, hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, hereinafter referred to as the "Organization," through which the members will report to one another on the measures taken and the progress achieved in the fields of action set forth above.

Then, in article I, the functions of the Organization were specifically described:

1. The Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture.

2. The Organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to—

(a) Scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture;

(b) The improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;

(c) The conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production;

(d) The improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;

(e) The adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;

(f) The adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

3. It shall also be the function of the Organization—

(a) To furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) To organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may

be needed to assist them to fulfill the obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and

(c) Generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the preamble.

It is specifically pointed out that the term "agriculture" and its derivations, is considered by the Organization to include fisheries, marine products, forestry, and primary forestry products.

I can assure you that it is not only the view of your Foreign Affairs Committee, but it is also the view of every witness appearing before us at the hearings on this measure, that the proposed organization will play an extremely important part in the post-war world. It will not only be a forum for the discussion of all problems arising in the field of food production and distribution, but it will also be able to formulate and recommend policies and practices to all associated governments and their peoples throughout the world. While not having nor assuming the power to enforce either its policies or recommendations, it can and will make its findings and information available to all countries constituting the organization and to their people. This information will include statistical and technical information as well as information of new discoveries, improved methods, and practices whenever and wherever developed. It will be one of the greatest of all educational institutions, and it is impossible to estimate the benefits to be derived from its dissemination of information on nutrition, foods, and agriculture.

The structure of the Organization is extremely simple. This matter is fully covered in the report of your committee, and I feel there is no necessity to occupy your time by a repetition here of that part of the report.

As a member of the Organization, the obligations of the United States will not be many nor great. For the first year, the Organization's budget calls for the expenditure of \$2,500,000, of which the contribution of the United States will be \$625,000. It is estimated that the annual budget for subsequent years will be in the neighborhood of \$5,000,000 annually. Therefore, the pending resolution will authorize an annual appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$1,250,000, which may be the required contribution of this Government. Our other obligations in respect to the organization are in no wise burdensome and are such as are usually incident to membership in similar international organizations.

Reference is had in the pending resolution to the International Institute of Agriculture. This reference is made in section 3 of the resolution, which was inserted as a committee amendment. The International Institute of Agriculture, generally known as the Rome Institute, has an interesting and honorable place in the world's history. It is said to have been sponsored by the King of Italy, after the plan of American origin had been presented to him and had met with his approval. It was made the subject of a treaty, dated at Rome, Italy, on June 7, 1905, signed first by Italy, fol-

lowed by 39 other nations, the United States being the thirty-third signatory. The ratification of this treaty was advised by the United States Senate on June 27, 1906, and was ratified by the President July 7, following.

The treaty stipulated that the seat of the Institute should be at Rome, and there it has remained, housed, I understand, in a building provided by Italy's King. It is generally understood that the organization owns no buildings, or other real property, but that, possibly, its only assets at this time are its library and files of statistics gathered through the years.

The Rome Institute functioned splendidly in its limited field of activity from its inception down to the entry of Italy into the war. With the beginning of the war, the Institute became the captive of the Axis, and its activity ceased.

This Institute, during the years it functioned, confined itself in the greater part to the gathering and dissemination of agricultural and market statistics, with perhaps certain information on related subjects. It did not undertake, nor was it designed to cover the broader field in which the proposed food and agriculture organization will operate. As stated, with the entry of Italy into the war, the Rome Institute ceased to function. Having been established by treaty, however, it has certainly not been disbanded and must be considered as still existent as an organization. It is very probable that none of the signatories of the treaty have continued to pay their assessments for its maintenance during the past several years and its treasury is no doubt empty. In any event, while recognizing the value of the services rendered in the past by the Rome Institute, it is believed that no good purpose would be served through any attempt to revive and restore to life this institute with its limited scale of operations.

Your committee, after careful consideration of the statements made at the hearings by representatives of the Government, as well as by other witnesses upon this matter, amended the pending resolution by inserting section three, advising the integration of the functions and resources of the international, or Rome Institute, with those of the Food and Agriculture Organization. We are confident that this can be accomplished in a legal and orderly manner and that the resultant merger will add to the ability of the new organization to render services of great value.

It may be of interest to the Members of the House to know that the resolution under consideration has the unqualified approval of the State Department and the Department of Agriculture. At the hearings on the measure held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hon. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, appeared in person to urge approval of the resolution. Strong statements favoring the legislation were received from Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, and from Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton, and read into the record.

In person, endorsing the resolution, also appeared our former colleague, former member of the House, Hon. Marvin Jones,

now and for some time past War Food Administrator, and chairman of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs, Va., where the foundation was laid for the organization now being considered. Came also in person Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Claude L. Wickard, and Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Dr. Thomas Parran, both of whom stamped the resolution with their approval. Similar approval was voiced by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau, and Lewis G. Hines, representing the American Federation of Labor. Also heard in favor of the legislation were representatives of various other organizations, who either appeared in person or filed approving statements. No single voice was lifted in opposition. May I express to the House the earnest hope that the pending resolution will be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this measure was reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously. I believe it will be very helpful not only to the farmers of the country as a class but to all the people of our country and of the world. The production of food and agriculture is vital to the entire world, just as vital to us in the United States, whose interests we must always protect, as to the other nations of the world. The business of getting together and sitting around a table and discussing and deciding these problems, the world price of agricultural products, the quantity of products which will be produced in the different parts will play a very important part in the immediate post-war reconstruction period and in the future of the world. We can learn from other countries and they can learn from us.

The following is a copy of House Joint Resolution 145 and a copy of the constitution of Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations:

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

House Joint Resolution 145

Joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization"), the Constitution of which is set forth in Appendix I of the First Report to the Governments of the United Nations by the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, dated August 1, 1944.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed \$1,250,000 annually, as may be required for expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of State, for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share in the expenses of the Organization.

SEC. 3. Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any

person or agency shall on behalf of the United States accept any amendment under paragraph 1 of article XX of the constitution of the Organization involving any new obligation for the United States.

SEC. 4. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the understanding that paragraph 2 of article XIII does not authorize the Conference of the Organization to so modify the provisions of its constitution as to involve any new obligation for the United States.

CONSTITUTION OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

PREAMBLE

The nations accepting this constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of

raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy,

hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, hereinafter referred to as the "Organization," through which the Members will report to one another on the measures taken and the progress achieved in the fields of action set forth above.

ARTICLE I (FUNCTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION)

1. The Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture.

2. The Organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to

(a) scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture;

(b) the improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;

(c) the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production;

(d) the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;

(e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;

(f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

3. It shall also be the function of the Organization

(a) to furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfill the obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and

(c) generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the Preamble.

ARTICLE II (MEMBERSHIP)

1. The original Members of the Organization shall be such of the nations specified in Annex I as accept this Constitution in accordance with the provisions of Article XXI.

2. Additional Members may be admitted to the Organization by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference and upon acceptance of this Constitution as in force at the time of admission.

ARTICLE III (THE CONFERENCE)

1. There shall be a Conference of the Organization in which each Member nation shall be represented by one member.

2. Each Member nation may appoint an alternate, associates, and advisers to its member of the Conference. The Conference may make rules concerning the participation of alternates, associates, and advisers in its proceedings, but any such participation shall be without the right to vote except in the case of an alternate or associate participating in the place of a member.

3. No member of the Conference may represent more than one Member nation.

4. Each Member nation shall have only one vote.

5. The Conference may invite any public international organization which has responsibilities related to those of the Organization to appoint a representative who shall participate in its meetings on the conditions prescribed by the Conference. No such representative shall have the right to vote.

6. The Conference shall meet at least once in every year.

7. The Conference shall elect its own officers, regulate its own procedure, and make rules governing the convocation of sessions and the determination of agenda.

8. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Constitution or by rules made by the Conference, all matters shall be decided by the Conference by a simple majority of the votes cast.

ARTICLE IV (FUNCTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE)

1. The Conference shall determine the policy and approve the budget of the Organization and shall exercise the other powers conferred upon it by this Constitution.

2. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast make recommendations concerning questions relating to food and agriculture to be submitted to Member nations for consideration with a view to implementation by national action.

3. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast submit conventions concerning questions relating to food and agriculture to Member nations for consideration with a view to their acceptance by the appropriate constitutional procedure.

4. The Conference shall make rules laying down the procedure to be followed to secure:

(a) proper consultation with governments and adequate technical preparation prior to consideration by the Conference of proposed recommendations and conventions; and

(b) proper consultation with governments in regard to relations between the Organization and national institutions or private persons.

5. The Conference may make recommendations to any public international organization regarding any matter pertaining to the purpose of the Organization.

6. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast agree to discharge any other functions consistent with the purposes of the Organization which may be assigned to it by governments or provided for by any arrangement between the Organization and any other public international organization.

ARTICLE V (THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE)

1. The Conference shall appoint an Executive Committee consisting of not less than nine or more than fifteen members or alternate or associate members of the Conference or their advisers who are qualified by administrative experience or other special qualifications to contribute to the attainment of the purpose of the Organization. There shall be not more than one member from any Member nation. The tenure and other conditions of office of the members of the Executive Committee shall be subject to rules to be made by the Conference.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article, the Conference shall have



regard in appointing the Executive Committee to the desirability that its membership should reflect as varied as possible an experience of different types of economy in relation to food and agriculture.

3. The Conference may delegate to the Executive Committee such powers as it may determine, with the exception of the powers set forth in paragraph 2 of Article II, Article IV, paragraph 1 of Article VII, Article XIII, and Article XX of this Constitution.

4. The members of the Executive Committee shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the Conference on behalf of the whole Conference and not as representatives of their respective governments.

5. The Executive Committee shall appoint its own officers and, subject to any decisions of the Conference, shall regulate its own procedure.

#### ARTICLE VI (OTHER COMMITTEES AND CONFERENCES)

1. The Conference may establish technical and regional standing committees and may appoint committees to study and report on any matter pertaining to the purpose of the Organization.

2. The Conference may convene general, technical, regional, or other special conferences and may provide for the representation at such conferences, in such manner as it may determine, of national and international bodies concerned with nutrition, food, and agriculture.

#### ARTICLE VII (THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL)

1. There shall be a Director-General of the Organization who shall be appointed by the Conference by such procedure and on such terms as it may determine.

2. Subject to the general supervision of the Conference and its Executive Committee, the Director-General shall have full power and authority to direct the work of the Organization.

3. The Director-General or a representative designated by him shall participate, without the right to vote, in all meetings of the Conference and of its Executive Committee and shall formulate for consideration by the Conference and the Executive Committee proposals for appropriate action in regard to matters coming before them.

#### ARTICLE VIII (STAFF)

1. The staff of the Organization shall be appointed by the Director-General in accordance with such procedure as may be determined by rules made by the Conference.

2. The staff of the Organization shall be responsible to the Director-General. Their responsibilities shall be exclusively international in character and they shall not seek or receive instructions in regard to the discharge thereof from any authority external to the Organization. The Member nations undertake fully to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the staff and not to seek to influence any of their nationals in the discharge of such responsibilities.

3. In appointing the staff the Director General shall, subject to the paramount importance of securing the highest standards of efficiency and of technical competence, pay due regard to the importance of selecting personnel recruited on as wide a geographical basis as is possible.

4. Each Member nation undertakes, insofar as it may be possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the Director General and senior staff diplomatic privileges and immunities and to accord to other members of the staff all facilities and immunities accorded to nondiplomatic personnel attached to diplomatic missions, or alternatively to accord to such other members of the staff the immunities and facilities which may hereafter be accorded to equivalent members of the staffs of other public international organizations.

#### ARTICLE IX (SEAT)

The seat of the Organization shall be determined by the Conference.

#### ARTICLE X (REGIONAL AND LIAISON OFFICES)

1. There shall be such regional offices as the Director General, with the approval of the Conference, may decide.

2. The Director General may appoint officials for liaison with particular countries or areas subject to the agreement of the government concerned.

#### ARTICLE XI (REPORTS BY MEMBERS)

1. Each Member nation shall communicate periodically to the Organization reports on the progress made toward achieving the purpose of the Organization set forth in the Preamble and on the action taken on the basis of recommendations made and conventions submitted by the Conference.

2. These reports shall be made at such times and in such form and shall contain such particulars as the Conference may request.

3. The Director General shall submit these reports, together with analyses thereof, to the Conference and shall publish such reports and analyses as may be approved for publication by the Conference together with any reports relating thereto adopted by the Conference.

4. The Director General may request any Member nation to submit information relating to the purpose of the Organization.

5. Each Member nation shall, on request, communicate to the Organization, on publication, all laws and regulations and official reports and statistics concerning nutrition, food, and agriculture.

#### ARTICLE XII (COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS)

1. In order to provide for close cooperation between the Organization and other public international organizations with related responsibilities, the Conference may, subject to the provisions of Article XIII, enter into agreements with the competent authorities of such organizations defining the distribution of responsibilities and methods of cooperation.

2. The Director-General may, subject to any decisions of the Conference, enter into agreements with other public international organizations for the maintenance of common services, for common arrangements in regard to recruitment, training, conditions of service, and other related matters, and for interchanges of staff.

#### ARTICLE XIII (RELATION TO ANY GENERAL WORLD ORGANIZATION)

1. The Organization shall, in accordance with the procedure provided for in the following paragraph, constitute a part of any general international organization to which may be entrusted the coordination of the activities of international organizations with specialized responsibilities.

2. Arrangements for defining the relations between the Organization and any such general organization shall be subject to the approval of the Conference. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article XX, such arrangements may if approved by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast, involve modification of the provisions of this Constitution: Provided that no such arrangement shall modify the purposes and limitations of the Organization as set forth in this Constitution.

#### ARTICLE XIV (SUPERVISION OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS)

The Conference may approve arrangements placing other public international organizations dealing with questions relating to food and agriculture under the general authority of the Organization on such terms as may be agreed with the competent authorities of the organization concerned.

#### ARTICLE XV (LEGAL STATUS)

1. The Organization shall have the capacity of a legal person to perform any legal act appropriate to its purpose which is not beyond the powers granted to it by this Constitution.

2. Each Member nation undertakes, insofar as it may be possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the Organization all the immunities and facilities which it accords to diplomatic missions, including inviolability of premises and archives, immunity from suit, and exemptions from taxation.

3. The Conference shall make provision for the determination by an administrative tribunal of disputes relating to the conditions and terms of appointment of members of the staff.

#### ARTICLE XVI (FISH AND FOREST PRODUCTS)

In this Constitution the term "agriculture" and its derivatives include fisheries, marine products, forestry, and primary forestry products.

#### ARTICLE XVII (INTERPRETATION OF CONSTITUTION)

Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation of this Constitution or any international convention adopted thereunder shall be referred for determination to an appropriate international court or arbitral tribunal in the manner prescribed by rules to be adopted by the Conference.

#### ARTICLE XVIII (EXPENSES)

1. Subject to the provisions of Article XXV, the Director-General shall submit to the Conference an annual budget covering the anticipated expenses of the Organization. Upon approval of a budget the total amount approved shall be allocated among the Member nations in proportions determined, from time to time, by the Conference. Each Member nation undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Organization promptly its share of the expenses so determined.

2. Each Member nation shall, upon its acceptance of this Constitution, pay as its first contribution its proportion of the annual budget for the current financial year.

3. The financial year of the Organization shall be July 1 to June 30 unless the Conference should otherwise determine.

#### ARTICLE XIX (WITHDRAWAL)

Any Member nation may give notice of withdrawal from the Organization at any time after the expiration of four years from the date of its acceptance of this Constitution. Such notice shall take effect one year after the date of its communication to the Director-General of the Organization subject to the Member nation's having at that time paid its annual contribution for each year of its membership including the financial year following the date of such notice.

#### ARTICLE XX (AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION)

1. Amendments to this Constitution involving new obligations for Member nations shall require the approval of the Conference by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference and shall take effect on acceptance by two-thirds of the Member nations for each Member nation accepting the amendment and thereafter for each remaining Member nation on acceptance by it.

2. Other amendments shall take effect on adoption by the Conference by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference.

#### ARTICLE XXI (ENTRY INTO FORCE OF CONSTITUTION)

1. This Constitution shall be open to acceptance by the nations specified in Annex I.

2. The instruments of acceptance shall be transmitted by each government to the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, which shall notify

their receipt to the governments of the nations specified in Annex I. Acceptance may be notified to the Interim Commission through a diplomatic representative in which case the instrument of acceptance must be transmitted to the Commission as soon as possible thereafter.

3. Upon the receipt by the Interim Commission of twenty notifications of acceptance the Interim Commission shall arrange for this Constitution to be signed in a single copy by the diplomatic representatives, duly authorized thereto, of the nations who shall have notified their acceptance, and upon being so signed on behalf of not less than twenty of the nations specified in Annex I this Constitution shall come into force immediately.

4. Acceptances the notification of which is received after the entry into force of this Constitution shall become effective upon receipt by the Interim Commission or the Organization.

#### ARTICLE XXII (FIRST SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE)

The United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture shall convene the first session of the Conference to meet at a suitable date after the entry into force of this Constitution.

#### ARTICLE XXIII (LANGUAGES)

Pending the adoption by the Conference of any rules regarding languages, the business of the Conference shall be transacted in English.

#### ARTICLE XXIV (TEMPORARY SEAT)

The temporary seat of the Organization shall be at Washington unless the Conference should otherwise determine.

#### ARTICLE XXV (FIRST FINANCIAL YEAR)

The following exceptional arrangements shall apply in respect of the financial year in which this Constitution comes into force:

(a) the budget shall be the provisional budget set forth in Annex II to this Constitution; and

(b) the amounts to be contributed by the Member nations shall be in the proportions set forth in Annex II to this Constitution: *Provided that each Member nation may deduct therefrom the amount already contributed by it toward the expenses of the Interim Commission.*

#### ARTICLE XXVI (DISSOLUTION OF THE INTERIM COMMISSION)

On the opening of the first session of the Conference, the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture shall be deemed to be dissolved and its records and other property shall become the property of the Organization.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it may be well to review briefly a little past history. Back in 1907, I think it was, 40 or more nations, including the United States, entered into a treaty which established the Agricultural Institute at Rome. I think the suggestion did not originate with the United States but with some other nations, including the then Italian Government. That Institute was supported financially by contributions from the signatory powers, including ourselves, for a long time. It was largely confined to the gathering of statistics. The Italian Government of that day granted to it the use free of charge of an Italian public building. The Institute owned no real estate, but it did acquire during that rather long period quite a statistical library, probably of some value. Then

the Fascist government came along and the picture in Italy changed completely. Finally, of course, Mussolini took his country into war against the United Nations.

The Institute at Rome became immediately the captive of the Italian Fascist government and ceased to operate. However, we are informed that the library is still there and intact.

Your committee, in taking into consideration the proposals that we give our approval and consent to the establishment of this Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, made inquiry especially as to what might be done now that the Fascist regime in Italy has been driven out with the old Institute at Rome which owed its existence to a treaty, to which the United States was a party. We were assured by representatives of the State Department that the moment this new and larger organization is organized as the result of the consent of the required number of signatory powers, effective steps will be taken to absorb in orderly fashion the remaining property of the old Institute at Rome, so that those who have contributed to it in the past would be completely satisfied that their contribution had not been completely lost. I thought it well to state that for the RECORD, because, after all, when we are about to embark upon an international undertaking involving participation of the United States, we want to be sure that the record of the past is straightened out and that appropriate steps are taken to liquidate, as it were, and absorb the Rome Institute in orderly fashion without being charged with deliberately and intentionally breaking a treaty obligation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Would the gentleman be kind enough to put in the RECORD the amount each nation participated in that program?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am afraid I cannot do that, may I say to the gentleman. Within my recollection, we did not inquire as to how much each nation participated.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. What is the question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The question is how much money the different nations contributed to the Rome Institute.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. If I understand the figures correctly, the last year we participated, which has been some years ago, the total amount was \$285,000. Our part of it was \$61,000, as I understand it. I do not know what the previous years were.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What is contemplated to be our contribution in this new organization?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Our contribution is set forth in this resolution now before the House.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. A million and a quarter dollars?

Mr. WADSWORTH. After the first year. It should be understood, however, that this Organization will cover an infinitely larger field than the old Institute in Rome ever expected to cover or was intended to cover.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is this million and a quarter dollars based upon an equal contribution by the other signatory powers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Our proportionate contribution will amount to about 25 percent of the cost of the maintenance of the organization.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How many other powers are likely to go into it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Forty-odd.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And we are paying 25 percent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. That includes the smaller nations, however, that could not be expected to contribute as much.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why does it seem necessary for the United States to contribute 25 percent of the total where 40 nations are participating?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is proposed that we contribute in proportion to our national income.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What is likely to happen to the post-war agricultural surpluses in this country if this is intended to encourage an increase of agricultural production in these other countries?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This Organization will have no power to impose its will upon any country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will be a center of information available to all the Governments that subscribe to this thing which will give them the last returns, as it were, and the trends of the production of food and the conditions of nutrition among the various peoples of the earth.

I may say that all our farm organizations of the United States are heartily in favor of the United States signing up with this Organization, believing as they do that it will be beneficial to our agriculture to know what is going on in other countries, what changes in trends are taking place, so that we may adjust our production in our own way to meet those changes in trends. That is the purpose of it. It covers a far wider field than the old Rome Institute was intended to cover.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is interesting because I read here in the report that the function of the Organization shall be "scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture. The improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In other words, they are to help out the other nations; recommend to them scientific methods of production in agriculture, is that true?



Mr. WADSWORTH. In places where they are short; yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Are we not then contributing money to this Organization to help other nations compete with us in agriculture when we are likely to have a surplus?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Remember that we are to be represented on this thing. As a matter of fact, as I look upon it, if this thing is wisely managed among the nations it will decrease competition in places where competition should not exist. There are surfaces of the earth where millions and millions of people are living next door to starvation all the time. It is a ghastly situation. This organization may spread to those people educational information so that the governments in those regions of the earth may establish better conditions for the production of food and the giving of proper nutriment to these millions of people. If they become better fed and more secure, it is to our advantage. It is distinctly to the disadvantage of a country like the United States to have half of the world on the verge of starvation, and if we can by educational methods help to relieve that situation in cooperation with these other nations, we will have helped ourselves as well as them.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the objections to the passage of this resolution, if any, stem back to the secrecy that was thrown around the Conference on Food and Agriculture held at Hot Springs in the spring of 1943. It was a great mistake to clothe the Hot Springs meeting in secrecy, because secrecy in a free country creates suspicion. Were it not for the suspicion engendered by the secrecy thrown around the Conference I do not believe there would be a single vote cast against this resolution. The Interim Commission appointed at Hot Springs, however, drafted a constitution that we have all had an opportunity to study. And the clear-cut, frank statements contained in the constitution should allay any suspicions that any of us may have entertained. It is, in my opinion, a splendid piece of work, and I think everyone will approve of the objectives set forth in the constitution.

The objectives as set forth in the constitution are as follows:

First:

Raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions.

Of course, we are all in favor of the first objective.

Second:

Securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products.

No one can raise a valid complaint to that objective.

Third:

Bettering the condition of rural populations.

As the gentleman from New York stated, there are millions of people in the

world today and there have been for centuries past who are underfed. Malnutrition is one of the greatest scourges of civilization. We have it right here in America in spite of the fact that now and then we have enormous surpluses in certain crops.

In the State of Virginia, from which I come, this sad and deplorable fact was recently brought to our attention when we found that 52 percent of our young men, when called to the colors, were turned down. They were not physically fit. Why? At least 75 percent of the ailments from which they were suffering stemmed back to malnutrition. The same thing is happening in every State in this Union to a greater or less extent, despite the fact that our people are the best fed people in the world.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman believe some world organization of 40 other powers will help our condition here in the United States with respect to malnutrition?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I certainly do. I think that if a proper study is made and this information is given to the peoples of the world, that the standard of living of all the people in all the nations, including America, will be increased from year to year. And remember when we increase the standard of living of some nation today which is living in poverty, we improve the financial status of that nation. We increase the wealth of that nation. We make it possible for that nation to deal with us, to buy our goods. Commerce begins to spring up. What commerce do we have, for instance, with Asia today? Eighty percent of the people of Asia today are engaged in agriculture, yet the Asiatics are probably the worst-fed people in the world. Suppose we succeed in increasing their standard of living and thereby increase their financial standing, is it not reasonable to suppose that in a few years commerce will spring up between Asia and America?

Miss SUMNERS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. A series of laudable objectives for this Organization is listed in the committee report, but the constitution of the Organization itself is not given. I should like to know where we can get hold of that. In connection with the Bretton Woods Organization, the objectives were just the opposite of the constitution.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The constitution is set out in full in House Document No. 128, Seventy-ninth Congress, beginning on page 33, and contains not only the objectives of the Organization but the functions of the Organization. I read the objectives from the constitution a few minutes ago. The functions of the Organization are also stated in the constitution. Let me read them:

#### ARTICLE I (FUNCTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION)

1. The Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture.

2. The Organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to

(a) scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture;

(b) the improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;

(c) the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production;

(d) the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;

(e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;

(f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

3. It shall also be the function of the Organization

(a) to furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfill the obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and

(c) generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the Preamble.

Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be the please of the House to adopt this joint resolution unanimously.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the constitution of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations be printed at this point in the RECORD. It certainly ought to be here. There must have been a mistake in the printing of the committee report that the constitution of the Organization was not included in it. It ought also to be in the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The constitution of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is as follows:

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

##### PREAMBLE

The Nations accepting this Constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy,

hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, hereinafter referred to as the "Organization," through which the Members will report to one another on the measures taken and the progress achieved in the fields of action set forth above.

#### ARTICLE I (FUNCTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION)

1. The Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food and agriculture.

2. The Organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to

(a) scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food and agriculture;

(b) the improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;

(c) the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production;

(d) the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;

(e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;

(f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

3. It shall also be the function of the Organization.

(a) to furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfill the obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and

(c) generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the Preamble.

#### ARTICLE II (MEMBERSHIP)

1. The original Members of the Organization shall be such of the nations specified in Annex I as accept this Constitution in accordance with the provisions of Article XXI.

2. Additional Members may be admitted to the Organization by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference and upon acceptance of this Constitution as in force at the time of admission.

#### ARTICLE III (THE CONFERENCE)

1. There shall be a Conference of the Organization in which each Member nation shall be represented by one member.

2. Each Member nation may appoint an alternate, associates, and advisers to its member of the Conference. The Conference may make rules concerning the participation of alternates, associates, and advisers in its proceedings, but any such participation shall be without the right to vote except in the case of an alternate or associate participating in the place of a member.

3. No member of the Conference may represent more than one Member nation.

4. Each Member nation shall have only one vote.

5. The Conference may invite any public international organization which has responsibilities related to those of the Organization to appoint a representative who shall participate in its meetings on the conditions prescribed by the Conference. No such representative shall have the right to vote.

6. The Conference shall meet at least once in every year.

7. The Conference shall elect its own officers, regulate its own procedure, and make rules governing the convocation of sessions and the determination of agenda.

8. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Constitution or by rules made by the Conference, all matters shall be decided by the Conference by a simple majority of the votes cast.

#### ARTICLE IV (FUNCTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE)

1. The Conference shall determine the policy and approve the budget of the Organization and shall exercise the other powers conferred upon it by this Constitution.

2. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast make recommendations concerning questions relating to food and agriculture to be submitted to Member nations for consideration with a view to implementation by national action.

3. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast submit conventions concerning questions relating to food and agriculture to Member nations for consideration with a view to their acceptance by the appropriate constitutional procedure.

4. The Conference shall make rules laying down the procedure to be followed to secure:

(a) proper consultation with governments and adequate technical preparation prior to consideration by the Conference of proposed recommendations and conventions; and

(b) proper consultation with governments in regard to relations between the Organization and national institutions or private persons.

5. The Conference may make recommendations to any public international organization regarding any matter pertaining to the purpose of the Organization.

6. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast agree to discharge any other functions consistent with the purposes of the Organization which may be assigned to it by governments or provided for by any arrangement between the Organization and any other public international organization.

#### ARTICLE V (THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE)

1. The Conference shall appoint an Executive Committee consisting of not less than nine or more than fifteen members or alternate or associate members of the Conference or their advisers who are qualified by administrative experience or other special qualifications to contribute to the attainment of the purpose of the Organization. There shall be not more than one member from any Member nation. The tenure and other conditions of office of the members of the Executive Committee shall be subject to rules to be made by the Conference.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article, the Conference shall have regard in appointing the Executive Committee to the desirability that its membership should reflect as varied as possible an experience of different types of economy in relation to food and agriculture.

3. The Conference may delegate to the Executive Committee such powers as it may determine, with the exception of the powers set forth in paragraph 2 of Article II, Article IV, paragraph 1 of Article VII, Article XIII, and Article XX of this Constitution.

4. The members of the Executive Committee shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the Conference on behalf of the whole Conference and not as representatives of their respective governments.

5. The Executive Committee shall appoint its own officers and, subject to any decisions of the Conference, shall regulate its own procedure.

#### ARTICLE VI (OTHER COMMITTEES AND CONFERENCES)

1. The Conference may establish technical and regional standing committees and may appoint committees to study and report on any matter pertaining to the purpose of the Organization.

2. The Conference may convene general, technical, regional, or other special conferences and may provide for the representation at such conferences, in such manner as it may determine, of national and international bodies concerned with nutrition, food, and agriculture.

#### ARTICLE VII (THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL)

1. There shall be a Director-General of the Organization who shall be appointed by the Conference by such procedure and on such terms as it may determine.

2. Subject to the general supervision of the Conference and its Executive Committee, the Director General shall have full power and authority to direct the work of the Organization.

3. The Director-General or a representative designated by him shall participate, without the right to vote, in all meetings of the Conference and of its Executive Committee and shall formulate for consideration by the Conference and the Executive Committee proposals for appropriate action in regard to matters coming before them.

#### ARTICLE VIII (STAFF)

1. The staff of the Organization shall be appointed by the Director-General in accordance with such procedure as may be determined by rules made by the Conference.

2. The staff of the Organization shall be responsible to the Director-General. Their responsibilities shall be exclusively international in character and they shall not seek or receive instructions in regard to the discharge thereof from any authority external to the Organization. The Member nations undertake fully to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the staff and not to seek to influence any of their nationals in the discharge of such responsibilities.

3. In appointing the staff the Director General shall, subject to the paramount importance of securing the highest standards of efficiency and of technical competence, pay due regard to the importance of selecting personnel recruited on as wide a geographical basis as is possible.

4. Each Member nation undertakes, insofar as it may be possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the Director General and senior staff diplomatic privileges and immunities and to accord to other members of the staff all facilities and immunities accorded to non-diplomatic personnel attached to diplomatic missions, or alternatively to accord to such other members of the staff the immunities and facilities which may hereafter be accorded to equivalent members of the staffs of other public international organizations.

#### ARTICLE IX (SEAT)

The seat of the Organization shall be determined by the Conference.

#### ARTICLE X (REGIONAL AND LIAISON OFFICES)

1. There shall be such regional offices as the Director General, with the approval of the Conference may decide.

2. The Director General may appoint officials for liaison with particular countries or areas subject to the agreement of the government concerned.

#### ARTICLE XI (REPORTS BY MEMBERS)

1. Each Member nation shall communicate periodically to the Organization reports on the progress made toward achieving the purpose of the Organization set forth in the Preamble and on the action taken on the basis of recommendations made and conventions submitted by the Conference.

2. These reports shall be made at such times and in such form and shall contain such particulars as the Conference may request.

3. The Director General shall submit these reports, together with analyses thereof, to the Conference and shall publish such reports and analyses as may be approved for publication by the Conference together with any reports relating thereto adopted by the Conference.

4. The Director General may request any Member nation to submit information relating to the purpose of the Organization.

5. Each Member nation shall, on request, communicate to the Organization, on publication, all laws and regulations and official reports and statistics concerning nutrition, food, and agriculture.



#### ARTICLE XIII (COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS)

1. In order to provide for close cooperation between the Organization and other public international organizations with related responsibilities, the Conference may, subject to the provisions of Article XIII, enter into agreements with the competent authorities of such organizations defining the distribution of responsibilities and methods of cooperation.

2. The Director-General may, subject to any decisions of the Conference, enter into agreements with other public international organizations for the maintenance of common services, for common arrangements in regard to recruitment, training, conditions of service, and other related matters, and for interchanges of staff.

#### ARTICLE XIII (RELATION TO ANY GENERAL WORLD ORGANIZATION)

1. The Organization shall, in accordance with the procedure provided for in the following paragraph, constitute a part of any general international organization to which may be entrusted the coordination of the activities of international organizations with specialized responsibilities.

2. Arrangements for defining the relations between the Organization and any such general organization shall be subject to the approval of the Conference. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article XX, such arrangements may, if approved by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast, involve modification of the provisions of this Constitution: Provided that no such arrangements shall modify the purposes and limitations of the Organization as set forth in this Constitution.

#### ARTICLE XIV (SUPERVISION OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS)

The Conference may approve arrangements placing other public international organizations dealing with questions relating to food and agriculture under the general authority of the Organization on such terms as may be agreed with the competent authorities of the organization concerned.

#### ARTICLE XV (LEGAL STATUS)

1. The Organization shall have the capacity of a legal person to perform any legal act appropriate to its purpose which is not beyond the powers granted to it by this Constitution.

2. Each Member nation undertakes, insofar as it may be possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the Organization all the immunities and facilities which it accords to diplomatic missions, including inviolability of premises and archives, immunity from suit, and exemptions from taxation.

3. The Conference shall make provision for the determination by an administrative tribunal of disputes relating to the conditions and terms of appointment of members of the staff.

#### ARTICLE XVI (FISH AND FOREST PRODUCTS)

In this Constitution the term "agriculture" and its derivatives include fisheries, marine products, forestry, and primary forestry products.

#### ARTICLE XVII (INTERPRETATION OF CONSTITUTION)

Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation of this Constitution or any international convention adopted thereunder shall be referred for determination to an appropriate international court or arbitral tribunal in the manner prescribed by rules to be adopted by the Conference.

#### ARTICLE XVIII (EXPENSES)

1. Subject to the provision of Article XXV, the Director-General shall submit to the Conference an annual budget covering the anticipated expenses of the Organization. Upon approval of a budget the total amount approved shall be allocated among the Member nations in proportions determined, from time

to time, by the Conference. Each Member nation undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Organization promptly its share of the expenses so determined.

2. Each Member nation shall, upon its acceptance of this Constitution, pay as its first contribution its proportion of the annual budget for the current financial year.

3. The financial year of the Organization shall be July 1 to June 30 unless the Conference should otherwise determine.

#### ARTICLE XIX (WITHDRAWAL)

Any Member nation may give notice of withdrawal from the Organization at any time after the expiration of four years from the date of its acceptance of this Constitution. Such notice shall take effect one year after the date of its communication to the Director-General of the Organization subject to the Member nation's having at that time paid its annual contribution for each year of its membership including the financial year following the date of such notice.

#### ARTICLE XX (AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION)

1. Amendments to this Constitution involving new obligations for Member nations shall require the approval of the Conference by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference and shall take effect on acceptance by two-thirds of the Member nations for each Member nation accepting the amendment and thereafter for each remaining Member nation on acceptance by it.

2. Other amendments shall take effect on adoption by the Conference by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference.

#### ARTICLE XXI (ENTRY INTO FORCE OF CONSTITUTION)

1. This Constitution shall be open to acceptance by the nations specified in Annex I.

2. The instruments of acceptance shall be transmitted by each government to the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, which shall notify their receipt to the governments of the nations specified in Annex I. Acceptance may be notified to the Interim Commission through a diplomatic representative, in which case the instrument of acceptance must be transmitted to the Commission as soon as possible thereafter.

3. Upon the receipt by the Interim Commission of twenty notifications of acceptance the Interim Commission shall arrange for this Constitution to be signed in a single copy by the diplomatic representatives, duly authorized thereto, of the nations who shall have notified their acceptance, and upon being so signed on behalf of not less than twenty of the nations specified in Annex I this Constitution shall come into force immediately.

4. Acceptances the notification of which is received after the entry into force of this Constitution shall become effective upon receipt by the Interim Commission or the Organization.

#### ARTICLE XXII (FIRST SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE)

The United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture shall convene the first session of the Conference to meet at a suitable date after the entry into force of this Constitution.

#### ARTICLE XXIII (LANGUAGES)

Pending the adoption by the Conference of any rules regarding languages, the business of the Conference shall be transacted in English.

#### ARTICLE XXIV (TEMPORARY SEAT)

The temporary seat of the Organization shall be at Washington unless the Conference should otherwise determine.

#### ARTICLE XXV (FIRST FINANCIAL YEAR)

The following exceptional arrangements shall apply in respect of the financial year in which this Constitution comes into force:

(a) the budget shall be the provisional budget set forth in Annex II to this Constitution; and

(b) the amounts to be contributed by the Member nations shall be in the proportions set forth in Annex II to this Constitution: Provided that each Member nation may deduct therefrom the amount already contributed by it toward the expenses of the Interim Commission.

#### ARTICLE XXVI (DISSOLUTION OF THE INTERIM COMMISSION)

On the opening of the first session of the Conference, the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture shall be deemed to be dissolved and its records and other property shall become the property of the Organization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

#### IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation for two definite reasons:

First. The first reason this legislation merits our support is because it provides the machinery for friendly agricultural relations between countries. This legislation is a forward step in effectuating world peace. The rural people of the world are peace loving, and as a group should be coordinated in an effort to bring and maintain peace in the world for all time. The land and who owns it, who controls it, and who works it has been one of the problems in history in relation to war. The land problem has been a real problem within countries as well as between countries. As a group the rural people of all countries are peace-loving people. The very nature of their farm life and the necessity of their cooperation with the many forces of nature to produce the necessities of life creates within them the fundamentals for peaceful relationships. The rural people on farms and in cities under 2,500 in population raise most of the children of the Nation.

The F. A. O. will give the rural people of the world an opportunity to study the agricultural problems of the world and give their members an opportunity to present their recommendations to the governments of the world. We, ourselves, could make good use of this information. We have not all the agricultural information in the world. If you call the Congressional Library and obtain the book on the Rothamsted Experiments, you will find that the English had a rather extensive knowledge of soil fertility 50 to 100 years ago. It is to be regretted that the World Food Conference at Hot Springs was shrouded in so much mystery. Open covenants openly arrived at applies to these agricultural discussions as much as to anything else.

If Representatives of the Congress from the important committees had been allowed to attend this Conference a better understanding of its objectives would have resulted.

Second. The second reason I feel this legislation deserves support is that this Organization could be the clearing house

for discussion of our many agricultural problems, in reference to our foreign agricultural commerce.

Our problems in foreign agricultural commerce today are different than ever before. One cause of this difference is the legislation that has been passed by our own Congress, such as the 90-percent parity floor price. Another difference is due to the fact that we have, as a nation, erected what constitutes import embargoes on foreign agricultural products as well as export embargoes on at least one agricultural product. We, as a nation, have adopted a program of paying export bounties in order to obtain a part of the world market for certain agricultural products. We have a domestic agricultural program based on a parity formula that is interwoven with our foreign agricultural program. We have strong farm organizations. We have strong leadership in our agricultural colleges. We have State departments of agriculture with capable agricultural commissioners in each State. We have a strong well-enlightened rural press in America. We have a broad rural Extension Service carrying the facts to the farmer in every county of the Nation. We have hundreds of agricultural classes in our high schools with well-prepared teachers. We have the A. A. A. reaching into every county in the Nation. We have the best brains of the Nation working year after year on this domestic agricultural program. We have between 200,000 and 300,000 full or part-time employees on the Federal pay roll carrying out this domestic agricultural program. We are appropriating about \$1,000,000,000 a year to carry on this domestic agricultural program. These many agricultural agencies are cooperating for the welfare of American agriculture. Do you wish to jeopardize this domestic agricultural program?

This world agricultural situation presents many questions. In our country a large percentage of the farms are owned by the men that live on them and operate them. This can appropriately be termed the "American way of farm life." Whether it is the most efficient method of producing food or whether it is not, the plans has made a great contribution to making America great. Can we talk about family-sized farms and owner-operated farms in our own country and invite more agricultural imports from countries where the agriculture of that country is based on a different concept of agriculture?

Many social problems are involved in this picture as well as the economics involved. It is fair to assume that the rural people are entitled to a price for their product that gives them equal opportunities with the other groups of our society. It is fair to assume that they are entitled to a price for their products that will enable them to farm their farms and not mine them, as they have done in total the past 200 years.

If we are justified and have reason to feel that this goal is meritorious and that our agricultural objective is desirable for our national welfare, there are many questions we should be asking ourselves today. Among them are:

First. How much further can we go in subsidizing exports wherein we capture our part of the world agricultural commerce by so doing?

Second. How much further should we go down the road of putting embargoes on exports or imports of agricultural products?

Third. Can we contend that we are helping the American farmer when we import agricultural products from a country where the land is owned by large landowners where they pay their farm labor from 15 cents to 50 cents per day? Or are we helping just a few large landowners?

Fourth. If these large landowners in foreign countries—that may control the country as well—pay the farm workers 15 cents to 50 cents a day, where are these farm workers benefited if the large landowners are allowed to ship the farm products to the United States markets in competition to our farmers? Do the shipments help a few large landowners only?

Fifth. Since the United States is a country with a high percentage of small landowners where the individual owns and operates his own farm, or at least that is the announced goal and objective, just exactly how are we going to maintain this American way of farm life when their farm products must compete with farm products of countries paying 15 cents to 50 cents per day for farm labor?

Sixth. If the establishment of steel mills in Brazil with United States Federal money as a loan and supposedly to be repaid, causes such a furor and criticism in the industrial world how do you justify the giving of the American market for farm products to countries with large landowners who pay 15 cents to 50 cents per day?

Seventh. If the policy is to be one of mutual benefit for the greatest number of people in all countries do you think more people could be benefited in a foreign country by helping to provide them good industrial jobs in steel mills and other industrial establishments in their own country than could be benefited by shipping their agricultural products to us in exchange for industrial goods?

Eighth. If it is a desirable national policy to further industrialize the United States and import still more competitive agricultural products why should we not be honest about it and tell the American farmer just what he can expect from such a program? Should we be a party to deceiving him and make him believe something is being done to help him when in fact we may be doing something to harm him?

If as in 1939 under our present domestic and foreign agricultural program many farm products brought as little as 45 percent to 60 percent of parity, and we imported \$526,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products, just exactly how many millions and billions of dollars' worth of agricultural products will come to our market if the 90-percent parity floor is maintained during the war and 2 years after the war? Is the answer that we will have to put on additional import quotas as proposed by representatives of the office of the Secretary

of Agriculture before the Agriculture Committee last week when the present bill was being discussed?

I do not claim to have the answers to all these questions. I would like to have them answered by someone who has responsibility to the people. I would like to have them ironed out by people representing the rural people of the United States. I do not subscribe to a program where magic and mystery supplant fairness and common sense.

The world agricultural organization would be the logical place for these discussions. If our agricultural exports are to be dependent on world marketing agreements that determine how much of the world market the American farmer can have, is there anything sinful in suggesting that the American farmer might be justified in having something to say about how much and how many foreign agricultural products can be imported into America? If we have a quota on exports should we have a quota on imports?

We must remember what the pre-war farm-price situation really was from 1930 to 1940. The approach is not how low the prices were in 1932 at a time of a world slump. Nor do I wish to be too critical of the prices prevailing in 1939 after millions had been poured into the farm program. But if we had 18 cents per bushel oats, 43 cents per bushel wheat in some States, 34 cents per bushel corn, 8+ cents per pound cotton, 16 cents per pound wool in Oklahoma, \$1.14 per hundredweight milk in many States, 20 cents per pound butter fat, and 12 cents per pound cheese, as well as 10,000,000 of unemployed immediately before the war, just exactly how are we going to prevent the 3-15 cents per hour labor return to these farmers after the war? Can we expect much purchasing power of people getting 3-15 cents per hour in our own country? Can we expect much purchasing power from people getting 5 to 50 cents in a foreign country? These are the questions. What is your answer and your approach? How are we going to be helpful and fair to our own rural people in relation to other groups of our society and not follow an unwise policy in our relation to the rural people and the peoples of other lands?

These are fair questions and deserve fair answers. House Joint Resolution 35 should help answer these questions.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman knows that this authority of this Organization seems to be absolutely unlimited. On page 4 of the constitution, it says:

It may perform any functions—

That is, this Organization may perform any function—

which may be assigned to it by governments or provided for by any arrangement between the Organization and any other public international organization.

That seems to give absolute and unlimited authority.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I might say as far as the authority is concerned, we know that just depends on who is



going to conduct it. As far as the money is concerned, it will not live very long if the Congress does not appropriate the necessary funds to keep it going. So any time this Organization is not performing in a manner to suit the United States, there is nothing permanent about the appropriation. There is no reason why the Congress cannot stop it any time it wants to after the preliminary period.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will remind the gentleman and the Congress that during the life of the Agricultural Institute there were years when Congress did not appropriate any money for the United States and the activity would cease. Therefore, there is a very easy way to cut off any activity when the funds are not appropriated. That can be done in this case if the appropriations find any danger to the welfare of the United States.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose we do set this Organization up and the members of the board from the United States make a lot of promises to other foreign countries. Then they come back to the Congress and ask for the appropriation and the Congress does not make the appropriation. What will the thought of those other nations be, "Why, America has promised to do certain things and it has fallen down." Now, you have to be very careful that we do not have men representing the American Government with these provisos and then the Congress fail to carry them out.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. My answer to the gentleman is, that he should not have any great worry as to what these peace-minded people, farm people, are going to do in connection with this organization. The rural people are the largest single group in the world.

Mr. RICH. I am not half worried about what the farmers of this country are going to do. I am worried about what the politicians are going to do.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The F. A. O. will allow the farm-minded people to keep the politicians in line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. For the purpose of supplementing the answer made to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] relative to some promises being made which the Congress might not keep; the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] referred to article IV of the constitution. That says:

The Conference shall determine the policy and approve the budget of the organization and shall exercise the powers conferred upon it by the constitution.

The Constitution expressly confers powers and it also expressly provides that those powers cannot be changed or enlarged except by a vote of two-thirds; and that the United States will not be bound except by act of Congress. So our representatives are bound by this Constitution and they cannot even change the Organization without an act of Congress authorizing it to be done.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I note the resolution provides for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding \$625,000 during the first fiscal year of the Organization, and sums not exceeding \$1,250,000 annually thereafter. This is permanent legislation, is it not?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is, but the Congress can always deny appropriations when it wishes to do so, I hope.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, while the most momentous Conference of our times is being held in San Francisco, we in Congress have a chance to test our own sincerity and implement fine words about peace, with action. The first permanent agency of the projected United Nations Organization is now before us. This agency deals with the most basic human needs.

In the midst of war it is right that our main concern in world organization should center on ways of dealing with further aggression. Yet this policeman's task is only part of the job. The other part, in the long run even more important, is correction of those conditions which breed wars. As nations develop peaceful ways of solving their problems, the policeman's task grows less.

Wherever there is hunger, recurrent plagues, and desperation, there is fertile soil for demagogues, dictators, and violence. And yet half of the world has never had enough to eat. In the past this was perhaps inevitable, but today modern farm techniques and transportation make it possible for man to conquer famine and free himself of this most desperate fear.

Aside from humanitarian reasons, the United States as the greatest creditor and exporter nation has a double stake in the project before the House. We want to increase stability throughout the world, thus removing the worst danger spots for the sake of our own security and in addition we want to raise the standard of living so that we can expand our own markets. Our best trading partners have always been nations with comparatively high standards of living.

The Food and Agriculture Organization will be a world-wide agency for pooling the best knowledge on the problems of nutrition, agriculture, and marketing. It will furnish scientific and technical help to governments requesting it and it will, in short, act as a fact-finding and fact-distributing agency. For a

highly developed nation like ours, F. A. O.'s chief direct service will be in statistical help in showing us the world picture and its agricultural needs. While it could invoke no authority over any nation's policy, it will offer constructive aid for all. Our investment in destruction has necessarily been vast. Now let us invest a comparatively tiny sum in constructive processes which can help stabilize the world against future wars.

The world is watching the United States as the pivotal nation in creating a durable peace. The greatest reassurance which we can give today is the unanimous acceptance of House Joint Resolution 145. This would show our readiness to joint with the United Nations' first permanent project to come before the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of House Joint Resolution 145, providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, because I believe its purposes and functions will not only be of benefit to the United States but will be an aid to obtaining world security and prosperity.

This bill was passed unanimously by our Foreign Affairs Committee and is strongly backed by the Surgeon General's Office, Department of Agriculture, American Federation of Labor, the Grange, the American Farm Bureau, and many other national organizations.

Its purposes and functions are simple. I believe in order to save time I could best state these functions by referring to the statement of Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, on page 23 of the hearings, and quote from his statement, because I believe it is the most concise and clearest statement of any of the witnesses who appeared before our committee:

#### SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Article I of the constitution then proceeds to define more precisely the functions which are to be performed by the Organization in the furtherance of these broad purposes. These include first the collection, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture. The second major function of the organization is the promotion, and in appropriate cases, recommendation of national and international action with respect to all types of research relating to food and agriculture; the improvement of education and administration, and the spread of public knowledge in these fields; the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production; improvement of processing, marketing, and distribution of agricultural products; the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, both national and international; and the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements. In all the fields in this second category of functions, it will be observed that the Food and Agriculture Organization is not itself the active agent for carrying its knowledge or recommendations into effect; its function is rather the promotion of knowledge and of desirable public policy in these fields, leaving individual

countries free to determine to what extent and by what methods they give effect to the recommendations of the Organization.

The third main function of the Organization is to assist in making technical assistance available to governments which desire it, in part by providing, in cooperation with governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them in realizing the purposes of the Organization.

The raw materials for the work of the Organization will be in large part the reports and information periodically made available by the member governments and such special reports as may be requested on the progress made toward achieving the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the preamble. These reports and statistics will serve a dual function: They will enable the Organization to serve as a research and statistical clearing house which member nations can use to help them achieve better levels of living for themselves, and in addition they will serve as a perpetual international reminder that facts and statistics and advice must find ultimate expression in human betterment. This two-way flow of information between members and the Organization will thus serve both to deepen and broaden the bases of knowledge and will cause each nation to examine its own experience and to determine how well it has applied the best knowledge and techniques available to it.

At the recent Food Conference when they drew up the constitution for this Organization, they made up a budget amounting to \$2,500,000 for the first financial year of the Organization. In this constitution each member nation was required to contribute a proportionate share of the Organization's budget, our share being 25 percent was \$625,000, for the first financial year. During subsequent years it was believed by the conference that the annual budget of the Organization would be in the neighborhood of \$5,000,000. Consequently, after the first year, our share would be not to exceed \$1,250,000.

When this bill was originally brought before our committee it authorized an appropriation of \$1,250,000 annually for our share in this Organization. I pointed out the fact in committee that our share for the first year would be only \$625,000 and suggested that we should make that fact clear to the Appropriations Committee in this resolution. Subsequently the words "not to exceed \$1,250,000 annually" were stricken out of the original bill and the following language substituted:

A sum not to exceed \$625,000 during the first year of the organization and sums not to exceed \$1,250,000 annually thereafter.

There is one additional feature I wish to call to your attention concerning this measure. In section 4 it provides:

Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States accept any amendment under paragraph 1 of article XX of the constitution of the Organization involving any new obligation for the United States.

Therefore this resolution makes it clear that no amendment is to be accepted on behalf of the United States under this paragraph unless the Congress by law authorizes such action. So our obligations under this bill are fixed and cannot be increased unless Congress so authorizes.

It may be well to call to your attention that we had been a member for many years of the International Institute at Rome which had for its purpose a similar objective. Naturally during the war days and Rome being occupied this organization ceased to function. The Organization attempted to be built here, however, goes beyond the scope of the Rome Institute since it dealt entirely with agriculture and did not deal with various aspects of food and nutrition.

Under section 3 of this bill it will probably be possible to salvage many assets of the old organization, known as the Institute of Rome.

It seems to me as we grow closer to final victory it is most urgent that we build a strong foundation for a peace that will last and one of the best ways to prevent aggression is, so far as possible, to remove the causes of discontent and the conditions that invite aggression. Lack of food, malnutrition, and economic instability of nations have been contributing factors to war.

If this measure will only help to remove some of these causes and get some of the ravaged countries back on their feet at a most negligible cost to ourselves, I believe it will be more than worthwhile. For if these countries are strengthened they in turn will be able to trade with us and we in turn will be the beneficiary.

This, to my mind, will be the first of the permanent organizations for world cooperation and I therefore urgently and respectfully request your support.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in speaking in favor of this resolution I do so with a very real sense of our obligation to the world to share our understanding of the scientific principles of farming and of food production with other peoples, as well as with a keen desire to have us participate in the benefits of the conference this Organization will make possible. I do so with the further certainty that only as the standard of life rises in the entire world will the hope for continued peace become a fact. Hungry people are dangerous people—dangerous to peace. It seems to me that the more we share in the dissemination of the benefits to be derived from a more and more adequate world food supply, the more we help build the bodies of the people of the world, especially as we serve to make it possible for them to raise their own food, the more likelihood there will be of building a sound economic structure throughout the world which in itself will be a strong guaranty of lasting peace.

It is my earnest hope that this Congress will support this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this resolution carries out the first one of the international agreements that our Government has entered into with

the other nations of the earth, and is the outgrowth of the conference held at Hot Springs in 1943. This conference of the United Nations on food and agriculture was the result of the vision and the initiative of President Roosevelt. He believed that there was a special appropriateness in the fact that the first collaborative action of the United Nations looking beyond the war period should be in a field that affected the welfare of so large a part of the world's population.

The hearing before our committee was most interesting. I wish the entire membership of the House could have heard the witnesses who appeared, and, if so, the action of the House today would be unanimous, as was the action of our committee. Secretary of Agriculture Wickard appeared in person. Secretary of State Stettinius sent a written statement. Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson testified. The Honorable Marvin Jones, who was for many years chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and who is now War Food Administrator and who was, by the way, the president of the Conference held at Hot Springs, made an excellent statement which appears in the hearings. Some of those who have been asking what effect this Organization is going to have upon our own agricultural interests should read the statement of Judge Marvin Jones. They should also read the statement contained in the hearings from the master of the National Grange, Albert S. Goss, and Mr. Edward A. O'Neill, of the American Farm Bureau, and other farm organizations, all of whom have given much thought and study to this problem and they realize that instead of hurting the farmers it is going to help them and help the nations of the world.

Another witness we had who was most interesting was the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Dr. Thomas Parran. His statement was most enlightening with reference to the need for some means of instructing the people with reference to food. The startling statement was made, verified and confirmed by others, that two-thirds of the people of the earth for a number of years have been hungry. As long as you have hungry people, as the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] said a few moments ago, there is a seed for war and when you can allay that, when you can have the people in a position where they are not hungry, they are not so likely to follow a Mussolini, Hitler, or any other dictator who will stir up a war.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We had two of the most prosperous nations start the present war, namely, Japan and Germany. Surely no one thinks that China or India started it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think it started down there in Italy when Mr. Mussolini, who ended his earthly career yesterday, started a drive down into Ethiopia. That was taken up by other countries and carried on.



Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is there any intention to bring in a bill to have us join an organization by which the manufacturing secrets of our industries shall be given to other countries?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. None that I know of. This Organization will not give any secrets to anybody. It is simply a clearing house for knowledge with reference to nutrition and food values. The gentleman from Indiana in reading the statement he did with reference to the functions of the Organization omitted some of the functions and only referred to one. It has several different functions, the first of which is that the Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture. Function number two is that the Organization shall promote and where appropriate shall recommend national and international action with respect to scientific, technological, and other knowledge, resources and so forth.

It is just simply a clearing house. It does not have administrative application and it will not take any affirmative action. It simply exchanges ideas and furnishes information to the member nations.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I am interested in what the gentleman and others have stated. Is not the Department of Agriculture already set up, able to do the very same things this will do?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. With reference to our own country; yes.

Mr. BONNER. If we are going into the international raising of food, then we could as well delegate the present Department of Agriculture to go out and disseminate knowledge throughout the world as to how to produce more food. There would not be any advantage to this Organization.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The advantage of this Organization is that 44 countries, it is hoped, will participate and will exchange their ideas with reference to various problems, transmit them to their people, and we will cooperate to the extent of our ability. The Organization, as such, will not raise or produce food.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I think anyone who believes in international cooperation at all must be for the pending resolution because I know of no form of international cooperation which is any less expensive, which is any milder or which is any broader with respect to the number of people and countries affected than this Organization.

The total financial contribution of this country for the first year will be about the same as the cost of one B-29 bomber. The extent of the authority given this organization is to carry on a research, statistical, and service program. It has no authority over any government but it is at the service of any member govern-

ment which wishes to make use of its facilities.

One reason I think that an organization of this kind may do a great deal toward bringing about world cooperation and eventual world peace is there is no subject in the world in which more people have an interest than food. It touches everyone. It offers a common ground upon which all the people of the world can get together. We are shocked these days in reading about the cruelties and the starvation carried on in the German prison camps. But I hope we do not overlook the fact that every year in this world there are perhaps 100 times as many people dying from starvation and malnutrition as have died in German prison camps, and that is a situation of which no American can be very proud. We in this country have taken food for granted. It does not touch our consciousness at all except perhaps in times like these when we have rationing and that sort of thing to contend with, but that is not true the world over. I am not afraid of competition with our agriculture in this country as long as there are millions and millions of people throughout the world who are undernourished. Until the time that the world can feed its people in something like an adequate manner I am not going to worry about what this Organization may do to the American farmer in the way of setting up competition. I do not think that the American farmers and their leaders in this country are very much worried about it either, because practically all of the farm organizations and many of the representatives of agriculture in Government appeared before the committee in support of this legislation.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, coming from the great agricultural State of California I desire to compliment and congratulate the committee on this very fine unanimous report. I think it should be significant to both sides of the center aisle that this is a unanimously approved resolution. I bespeak for it unanimous approval of this distinguished legislative body. This is another time when we can plant our feet again in the pathway to permanent peace. Let us not sidetrack and go off on a side rail in this history-making time of our world by refusing steadfastly and strongly—if you please, unanimously—this day to prove to the world that we have more pride, patriotism, and determination for world peace than we have greed for dollars.

Yes, gentlemen, I respectfully and emphatically use the term "greed for dollars." That same greed has, no doubt, been one of the major causes of world war—if, in fact, it is not the major cause therefor. It should be startlingly significant and strengthening that the membership of this distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted out this resolution we are now debating unanimously, which unanimous report came from the distinguished personnel of this committee at this time in the world's history. With the San Francisco United Nations Conference just beginning, it means

that no member of our Foreign Affairs Committee has been careless or hasty in his or her consideration of the import of this resolution. With such report emanating from this committee just at this time, after its most diligent, thorough-going study, hearings, and consideration, gentlemen, I feel this House has the right to expect a unanimous favorable vote. I have not yet heard a single sound remark against the proposal. If there be such, then let the Member holding such sincere, honest reason speak up, that we shall promptly debate and dispose of it. I am sure that any trivial, inconsequential, or political maneuvering or consideration will not enter into this epochal debate. I say epochal, because, it is just that. The passing of this resolution is definitely related to the strength or weakness of the national good will and relationship conferences going on this very hour in the history-making meeting of the United Nations, in my native State of California, at San Francisco. We must strengthen their hands, their minds, their spirits, by our decision here. Nor is it any inconsiderable import which our decision will have. This is the first time that this great Congress has been asked to speak out in support and vote for or against one of the national footsteps on the pathways to enduring peace.

There appears no question that the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs in May 1943 was another of the practical visions of the great initiative of our beloved late President Roosevelt, for the safety and security of the peoples of the world. We must look at it in that light not least of all. He knew and we know that food affects the welfare—yes the very survival—of every living person in every home, in every hamlet everywhere. History records there never has been food enough to sustain the health of all peoples. History also records that the first reason for malnutrition and hunger of people is poverty and lack of wherewithal to acquire food. There is no gainsaying the first responsibility for the health of its people rests with each nation to have that food and to take those steps. Too, there is no question either that the nations of the world now live so closely in our world neighborhood that this absolute necessity of food and health for the masses of people in the world can best be achieved by pulling together as world neighborhoods.

The sustaining freedom of want of food for daily need is fundamental to a just and permanent solution of all other national and world problems and relationships. A hungry world, or a world in which the majority of people are hungry, is a world in which the dictators and warmongers will again arise and thrive on human hungers and fears. We, today, have a chance for the first time in the world's history to plant a firm foot in the pathway of world peace to help to make it literally true that the masses of people in the world have sufficient to eat each day. Without this sufficiency world wars will continue and there will be no world security against war. In fact, gentlemen, if we today vote against

this resolution on account of not knowing exactly the number of dollars or cents which our Nation will have to contribute, or if we vote against it for any reason, in my judgment, we will be directly contributing to another world war in the lifetime of most of us on this floor this day.

The preamble of the constitution of this world Food and Agriculture Organization is set out on page 3 of the committee's report now in our hands. And in itself, it declares objectives, which should command the unanimous approval of this bill under the circumstances under which we are meeting. The nominal sum of dollars it will require from our Nation to be effective, in the presence of the significant meeting at San Francisco, out of which will either come world working machinery for enduring peace or the lack of it are inconsequential. That preamble states that the nations accepting it are determined to promote the common welfare of the world by furthering collective action on the part of those nations for the purpose which I shall read.

They are as follows:

First. Raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions.

Second. Securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products.

Third. Bettering the condition of rural populations.

If there cannot be international cooperation that the people of the world shall have daily food, I then cannot conceive of any field of international collaboration in which there can be enduring international agreement and accord. As food determines the health, mind, and spirit of a single individual, so it determines the same in the daily life of a nation; and as well it determines the daily attitude of all nations in this world neighborhood in which we now live. Our Nation cannot isolate itself ever again, either in food or anything else, and expect as a result thereof security in food or anything else, which the other peoples of the world have less of than they need. We must raise the level of living of the peoples of the world, in order to have security for our own level and standard of life. We must teach the peoples of the world to raise their own standards of living by cooperating with those people that they may better and more promptly know how to raise their own daily bread. This is fundamental, if we would have world security and world peace from wars. We must vote this resolution this day. It would be glorious for our Nation and the world if every Member on this floor would vote "aye."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, a very distinguished diplomat said to me when I was in Europe in October that he feared the peace would be even worse than the war. Of course, he meant the readjustment period, the period when there would be thousands of hungry people with no food to give them immediately, and perhaps not for some time. Certainly this agricultural constitution can be very help-

ful in working out an equitable and proper distribution of food and the raising of the necessary things with which to feed the people. Certainly we do not want the people of the world to starve in the end. That would not help the United States either. I saw hungry people in Italy and Belgium and France. I never shall forget last autumn.

That is for the humanitarian side of it, Mr. Chairman, but I should like to speak also of the practical, the business side of it, as far as the United States is concerned. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture made a statement before the Committee on Agriculture. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin if he has anything to say regarding that statement? It certainly has to do with the world price of agricultural commodities.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that the only point I wish to make in connection with his testimony is in answer to what we are going to do if we keep on putting on import quotas and also continue to pay export bounties. The Secretary himself referred it to his assistant, and his assistant said that the only thing we can do to protect the American market is to put additional embargoes on imports. That was one of the things I wanted to discuss if I had had more time today, because that is a pretty serious matter. That cannot be our only answer. If we are going to have a good, friendly agricultural relationship in this world, it appears to me that we are going to do it through this Organization much better than by having someone that just happens to want to put an embargo on something coming in here or on something going out of this country, because, to me, as far as peaceful relationships in this world are concerned, it is one of the most dangerous procedures we can get into unless it is by agreement between countries.

We may pay so much a bale or so much a bushel as an export bounty on certain agricultural products, and if it is agreed by this group that that is a part of the procedure, that may be a satisfactory arrangement. But if we are just going automatically to have an export bounty, we can take any market in the world if we can just figure out schemes to pay a big enough bounty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization") the constitution of which is set forth in appendix I of the First Report to the Governments of the United Nations by the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, dated August 1, 1944.*

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how there could be any justification for authorizing \$1,250,000 to be spent for any such pur-

pose as this for administrative expenses in a year. I know that for the first 6 months it is set at \$625,000, but that sounds like 10 times as much as it ought to be, and the other sounds as if it were 10 times as much as it ought to be, at least.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. With reference to the amount, may I say that 41 countries are now members of the Organization and 44 are expected to become members. The gentleman must realize that a great many countries will not be able to participate on account of the conditions, that is, they will not be able to contribute as much.

So far 54.5 percent of the entire cost has been underwritten by the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China. That is the beginning. It is thought when the Organization gets started and when war conditions no longer prevail and conditions are normal, our part will be less.

Mr. TABER. How can it be any such figure as given on these items? Frankly, I do not want to see any set-up of this kind carried through here and then somebody come to the Committee on Appropriations and tell us there are no justifications for any such figure and yet we are expected to provide any such amount.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I recall, the gentleman from New York, who is the ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations, does not make any appropriations unless they are justified by the agency coming before the committee. This joint resolution is merely an authorization. We appropriate no money whatever. I am sure the gentleman from New York, with the vigilance that he usually exercises with reference to safeguarding the Treasury, will see that we do not get gypped.

Mr. TABER. I will at least see that effort is made to keep it within bounds. But I think it is a terrible mistake and a reflection upon the Organization to authorize more than could possibly be justified by any stretch of the imagination.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It ought not to cost anything for these countries to get information they want from us. Their embassies can get the same books and pamphlets which are sent out to the Members of Congress and have them printed in their own countries. This idea of spending \$1,000,000 for a purpose like this seems preposterous to me.

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from New York, that at the present time under a different heading we are doing a little of the work that will be done by this Organization? For example, in the State Department, we have agricultural representatives in many of



these different countries and they are being paid at the present time.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. TABER. How much does it amount to?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not know how many there are. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] indicated a few minutes ago, in response to a question I propounded, that the cost now was about \$61,000 a year. That is, that was our contribution.

Mr. TABER. If that is our contribution, I would say that is plenty.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who is on his feet.

Does the gentleman desire to make any observation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman from Indiana has not explained my answer. The institute at Rome was a very small organization established for purely statistical purposes. Its total activity involved the collection of statistics and depositing them in a library. Now this Organization is intended to cooperate actively with 40 or 50 governments, giving the governments a chance to make use of whatever good information comes through this clearinghouse. Our last contribution to Rome was \$61,000. This is a much larger undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think if the gentleman will read the report, it states that not more than \$625,000 shall be spent the first year by the United States, and not more than a million dollars later if necessary. Of course, that depends upon the number of countries who join this agricultural organization. As more countries join, the amount each country will have to give will be less.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. How do you arrive at the figures? If there are 41 countries who now have joined this organization, how did you arrive at the figures?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I state to the gentleman that 20 countries have joined already.

Mr. RICH. If 20 countries have joined and we now are obligating the United States for 25 percent of the cost; if the number of nations is increased, what can we expect our proportionate percentage of the cost will be?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It will go somewhat according to national income, I believe. That is the method that has been evolved for our participation in other international organizations. Everything is done in a cooperative manner with other countries. It may not

be the correct way, but it has been the way that always has been followed. While the United States contribution is 25 percent of total, in 1940, the total income of the 44 nations was between two hundred and two hundred and twenty-five billion dollars. That of the United States was about seventy-five billion. The income of the United States was a third of the total income of the 44 nations, yet it contributes only 25 percent.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] said there was 50 percent of it being charged to our Government. How did you arrive at that figure?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, who made the statement, in order to reply.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. May I answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania by saying that our contribution is now on a 25-percent basis, but at no time can it exceed \$1,250,000. That is the ceiling for all time, or so long as we are members of this Organization. For the first year, our contribution is only half of that, or \$625,000.

Mr. RICH. Can this not be changed at some future date?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Unless the Congress of the United States changes it, it cannot be changed.

Mr. RICH. If you establish the precedent now that we take care of 25 percent of the expense or more and then eventually they make that change, will they not expect us to continue our same percentage of contribution?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I do not believe the gentleman heard what I said a moment ago. It is expected that after normal conditions are restored our percentage will be reduced rather than increased, because a great many countries cannot contribute at this time. The three major countries, the United Kingdom, Russia, and the United States, are paying over half of the amount now. When normal conditions are restored, then our part will be reduced. However, at no time can it be more than \$1,250,000, unless the Congress gives its authority so to do.

Mr. RICH. With reference to the work of our Department of Agriculture in this country, of course, I am in sympathy with trying to feed the nations of the world as far as we can, but I am also fearful of the promises or the implications that may be in this resolution so that in the future they may expect from us something that we are not able to perform.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman misconceives the purpose of the resolution. There is not going to be any food furnished under this resolution; nothing except information. There is no administrative agency. We do nothing except to help them help themselves by advising them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we did not contribute anything to the Ag-

ricultural Institute at Rome for some years. So that answers the question. If we find it inadvisable, we will stop contributing.

Mr. RICH. Were we parties to that agreement at Rome?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We were at different periods.

Mr. RICH. Were we ever asked to make any payments?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We did not make any for a time. At one time we contributed, but we dropped our participation. Then a bill was passed which authorized our participation again; but for a time we did not pay anything nor participate, although a member.

Mr. RICH. But every time we were requested to make a payment our country made that payment?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No, not always. For a period we did not. I voted against the agricultural institute bill. I felt that it would become a Fascist organ, and it did. I am not afraid that this organization will promote any political movement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to further discuss this question of the amount of the expenditure. I do not observe in the hearings any justification for the \$1,250,000. Of course, it is for salaries, I suppose. I would like to ask the chairman if that is the purpose. It is for salaries and expenses of employees, is it not?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; I should say so. I do not seem to have the break-down. The clerk to the committee had to go to California to the San Francisco Conference with Chairman BLOOM and there were some inadvertent omissions from the printed hearings.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In any event, it is for salaries of employees and their expenses; is that correct?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I cannot answer the gentleman's question accurately. I do not know all of the items but it will be for administrative expenses.

Mr. REES of Kansas. One further question: Are those persons, who are employed under this act, to be employees of the American Government?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; not all of the employees of the organization will be employees of the American Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is to say, a large share of this \$1,250,000 is to be paid to foreigners who are employed in this organization?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not necessarily all foreigners. Some of them will be American citizens. I imagine most of the information will come from our country because we are further advanced in agriculture than any other country in the world.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, where did you get the evidence to justify this amount?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The amount was an estimate made up by

the conference and the interim committee. The total estimated annual expenses of the Organization will be \$5,000,000 and our part will be 25 percent, or \$1,250,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But we do not have that before the House?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Unfortunately, I do not have the complete break-down.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It seems to me the least we can do is to have a justification before the House showing just how we are going to spend \$1,250,000.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. We are not going to spend a cent until after the Appropriations Committee goes into the complete break-down and makes an appropriation. This bill is merely an authorization bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman well knows that this is an authorization bill. Once we authorize it the appropriation will be made. The first justification in support of an appropriation is that it was authorized by the House. The distinguished Member from New York, as has been said, is one of the watchdogs of the Treasury and he will as far as he can see that we spend no more money than we have to; but I just fear that this is such an important matter that we ought to have the break-down before us.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am sorry I do not have the break-down.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is unfortunate that we do not. One thing is sure and that is that none of the \$1,250,000 will be spent for food for the starving people of the world. It will go for expenses.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wish to draw the attention of the gentleman from Kansas to article XIX of the constitution which we are here adopting by this resolution. It reads:

#### ARTICLE XIX (WITHDRAWAL)

Any member nation may give notice of withdrawal from the Organization at any time after the expiration of 4 years from the date of its acceptance of this constitution. Such notice shall take effect 1 year after the date of its communication to the director-general of the Organization subject to the member nation's having at that time paid its annual contribution for each year of its membership including the financial year following the date of such notice.

We are therefore in fact committing ourselves for 5 years, five times the amount we are authorizing to be appropriated in this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think as far as authorization is concerned we are authorizing the appropriation of somewhere between six and seven million dollars. I do not know what the amount will be, but the fact is that the House is sitting here considering spending \$1,250,000 a year that is to be charged to the Federal Treasury. The distinguished chairman in charge of the bill says he has no break-down but believes it will go for salaries and expenses of persons employed by this Organization.

Part of it is to provide employment for people in foreign countries, and yet we

do not have a break-down showing how it is going except that part of it will go to employment of foreign people, and some of it to Americans.

I believe the House is entitled to complete information on how it is to be used. We should not have to wait until an appropriation bill comes along. I know a million and a quarter dollars is small compared with a good many other expenditures made by this Congress. It is a pretty good-sized sum not to be itemized at all, all going for salaries and expenses of administration. Who will be employed, what they will do, and where employed, we do not know. About all we know is some of it will be paid to Americans and some to people of foreign countries. Even with the meager information before us, I believe you will accomplish more during the next year or two or three by cutting your administration expenses and use a good share of the \$1,250,000 for food.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that if a Member questions any items of legislation proposed by this committee, he is placed in the light of not wanting to cooperate with the nations of the world in bringing about a better understanding and working for the common good. Certainly we want to work with other nations for a better understanding and especially for a more adequate supply of food for the people of the world, many of whom are almost on the brink of starvation.

Many months ago I submitted to this House a proposal that we furnish food to the starving women and children of occupied countries. I got no action. I was told that foreign countries among our allies did not want us to do it. I have said on the floor many times that furnishing food to starving people will do more good than anything else to prevent war and bring about a more favorable understanding. Of course, we are in favor of doing our part to prevent hunger, poverty, and disease among the unfortunate people of the world. In fact, we are now about to face a tremendous job of immediately providing food for millions of starving people that have been overrun by the Axis Powers. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill says in substance that we, as one of the 44 members of the United Food Conference, will pay \$1,250,000 a year for carrying out the intentions of the conference. Not one dollar of this money goes for food for anybody. It is expense money. I thought the committee ought to explain how they expect the money to be spent. The committee report says that as one of the 44 nations we are to pay 25 percent of the expense, Great Britain about 16 percent, Russia 9 percent, and the remainder divided among the rest of the 44 nations.

It has been said by Members who have preceded me that the money will be used to secure information and statistics of various kinds with respect to the subject of food throughout the world. If the money is to be spent for salaries and expenses of experts and statisticians, we ought to know it. If it is going to pay the salaries of people in foreign countries to make studies suggested by the proponents of this legislation, we ought to have that information.

In any event, a million and a quarter dollars to spend every year for the next 5 years for expert information and statisticians is a pretty good-sized amount if that is what it is for. I think we could get enough information about the need for food in foreign countries without spending so much of it on experts and statisticians. It will do a whole lot more good if we are a little practical and spend it for food. People cannot exist very long on statistics.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not that we are proposing here to spend \$1,250,000 to employ anybody in particular. The significant thing we are doing is providing for an appropriate measure of American support for an organization which we hope will be an integral part of the machinery of peace in the world. In the few moments I have I would like to appeal to the House that we raise our sights about this proposition.

This is the first of these measures proposing international cooperation that has come before us. Some terribly difficult questions have to be thrashed out in San Francisco. I do not know whether they all will be thrashed out. But here is an opportunity for the nations to meet together in a wholly constructive proposition in connection with which there cannot, it seems to me, be any appreciable degree of international friction. The aim and objective of trying to raise the nutritional standards of the people of the world is not only a great humanitarian objective, but one directly in line with American self-interest, for the extent to which we do that will measure the degree to which the standards of living of people in other parts of the world will be raised and will lessen thereby the fear we may otherwise need to have of the importation of foreign products produced by people existing at substandards of living. To the extent to which the nations meet together in cooperative endeavor to solve the problems of humanity, to that extent they are laying the basic groundwork for peace, the only groundwork upon which a superstructure and organization of peace can possibly be built.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Is not the intent of this along the same lines that U. N. R. R. A. is operating, to feed and clothe people?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it is quite different.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no relief in this at all.

Mr. BONNER. No; but the dissemination of knowledge of the production of food.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is right.

Mr. BONNER. As a result of which will come about the feeding and clothing of the world.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is not relief.

Mr. BONNER. This is relief through a spreading of knowledge.



Mr. WADSWORTH. This organization extends no relief.

Mr. BONNER. Since the gentleman has risen, he is probably right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will yield to the gentleman if he would like me to.

Mr. BONNER. I wish to ask the gentleman further if this is not the same thing that the Department of Agriculture is doing domestically in the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. BONNER. Then we could by law give the Department of Agriculture orders to do the same thing all over the world.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not without the consent of the other nations, and this gives that consent.

Mr. BONNER. Then we should instruct the Department of Agriculture to join them and have this under that head.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then we would have to have an international agreement and this is what this resolution proposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BONNER. And I thank the gentleman, too.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, questions have been asked about the financing of this international agriculture institute, and it was pointed out that the American contribution to the old institution was much less than to the present one. If I understand the situation correctly, the old institute was financed mainly by money coming from the Italian Government, is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I take it that it is to the interest of the United States to see that such a thing shall not happen in the case of this new organization and that an enlightened view of our position with regard to it would be one where we would seek to do such fair share as might come to us in view of our position in the world and the economy of nations.

This organization will have no power or authority over any Nation in the world. It will only seek to build up a cooperative effort of the nations in an attempted improvement of the well-being of peoples from the point of view of food and agriculture. It is certainly a step toward world peace. And it is our minimum duty to take every such step we can in these solemn and critical days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am in thorough agreement with the objectives sought by the pending legislation, but I must frankly admit I do not understand just what we would be obligated to do if we join in this program. Therefore, I am seeking information more than anything else at this time. If we have been contributing about \$61,000 to a similar organization in the past I simply cannot understand

why all of a sudden we are called upon to increase our contribution to \$1,250,000 a year.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I will be glad to have the gentleman try to enlighten me a little more on it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will be glad to undertake to enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I suppose the gentleman is assuming I cannot be enlightened.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman asked a question and I shall attempt to answer it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will do so.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not casting any reflection at all on the gentleman. I think the fundamental error of the gentleman is that he is comparing this organization with the Rome Institute, which is entirely different. That was cited as an instance of an organization similar only in the respect that the Rome Institute was the collector of statistics. It has collected during the time it was in existence from 1907 to the present time a very valuable library with reference to statistics. This goes beyond that scope. It is much more comprehensive and covers a wider field of activity.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What is this organization supposed to do other than collect statistics?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I read it to the gentleman a moment ago. The gentleman read a part of it but did not read all of it. Let me read it to him again because I want to be sure I give the gentleman correct information.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have read through this report in which various things are outlined, but still I do not know what it means. For instance, we are going to furnish such technical assistants as any government may request. What does that mean? Are we going to send agricultural experts to teach other countries how to raise cotton, tobacco, corn, and wheat and so forth?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This organization will do several things.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Answer the question. Is that what we are going to do?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; not altogether. The Organization will not only furnish that, but each of these countries will have their own representatives present. When any information is sought the matter will be referred to those governments that have technicians to give the answer to any question that may be asked. In that respect this organization will be a clearinghouse for information and the impartation of that information to the various members of the Organization.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This does not only cover agricultural products but it covers marine products, fisheries, and forestry.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It covers fish because that is a food and therefore fisheries are included in it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How about forestry?

It appears, therefore, that we will send experts throughout the world to study and make recommendations concerning the fisheries and marine products and forestry industries.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. There is no obligation upon us to send anybody over there. This is an international organization. It may be that they will send somebody over here to teach us something.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We are obligated to join with about 41 other nations and contribute \$1,250,000 a year or 25 percent of the total cost. We are to have 1 vote in this organization, which will elect the officers, including the Commissioner General. This officer will be headman with authority to employ all the personnel and spend the money we contribute. It does not seem fair for us to pay 25 percent of the cost and have so little to say.

I am heartily in favor of trying to do something to help other people who are in need raise foodstuffs, but I think it is about time that somebody started thinking about the United States of America and what our generosity is costing. We hear much talk about international cooperation, and I am not opposed to any fair and reasonable agreement to this end, but I want to know exactly what kind of an agreement we are going into, what obligations we must assume and what it will cost. We are asked to pay 25 percent of the cost of setting up this organization and maybe somebody in Rome will be elected to spend the money and hire the employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I took this time to see if I could find out more about the bill. We have a pamphlet before us consisting of 44 pages which is, in fact, the constitution of this proposed organization. If we vote for this resolution we approve the constitution. There has been but 1 hour's debate on the measure, and I submit that it is unfair to ask us to approve this undertaking without more opportunity to inform ourselves as to just what it will mean to the United States.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. The gentleman from Texas brings this bill before us. There has been constant refusal here to give a breakdown of this \$6,000,000 obligation. Does the gentleman believe it is a military secret in any way? Does he not think we are entitled to a break-down here?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, we are particularly entitled to a justification of the money that we are asked to put into the enterprise.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The trick is that you do not know that this million and a half will be all you will be asked to give, because this international organization they are setting up is linked up by provisions to another one, just as are, for instance, the International Bank and the International Fund, in which we will put money, of which \$6,000,000 is only the initiation fee. It is so coordinated that it is provided that they have to cooperate with other organizations just like this, and for all we know they will come in and drag out millions of dollars from these other organizations for this purpose.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I assume the gentlewoman is referring to paragraph 5 under article III, where it says that the Conference may invite any public international organization which has responsibilities relating to those of the Organization to appoint a representative who shall participate in these meetings on the conditions prescribed by the Conference, and that no such representative shall have the right to vote.

I do not know; perhaps they could bring in U. N. R. R. A. and other international organizations that may hereafter be created.

May I direct this question to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]? I wonder if this organization would have the right to make a recommendation to the United States that our farmers here must be regulated and guided by these recommendations or findings.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You can make recommendations to governments based upon scientific research. This organization obviously, if it collects scientific information which it regards as valuable, may make recommendations to several governments over the face of the earth asking them to give serious consideration to this advance in science. It cannot impose its will upon anybody.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Russia is one of the great food-producing nations of the world, or at least she will be when she gets back to normal.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume so.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Suppose Russia begins raising a lot of crops we are raising here and in greater quantities than we have produced. She could recommend and insist that we cut out some of our crops because of competition and world surplus.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We do not need to do it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No, we do not have to, but as a member of this organization to which we would be contributing one-fourth of the cost to make the studies, we might have some obligation to follow recommendations of the Organization.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They do not say we have to do it. They cannot say that to us.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In other words, they make the recommendation and then we will pass on it here.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman is building up a straw man. This organization cannot tell us to do anything we do not want to do.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am mighty glad to know that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That would never have to come back to the Congress. All it would have to do would be to go to the Department of Agriculture, and under their crop-limitation control they could cut down our production.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is what I am trying to find out. The gentleman from New York says that is not the case.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that with all these countries gathering together to discuss information with regard to agriculture it is important to us to have a delegate there to sit in and represent the interests of the United States? I think it is very important to have that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think we ought to have such representation. If that is all there is to this proposal, I certainly would be in favor of it. But this resolution means much more than that and we are asked to pass on this matter here in an hour's time, and I am just not satisfied.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that this is one of the small things that will come before the House. Nevertheless, there should be some justification for it. As I see it, it is just one of the many international organizations that are going to be set up. There should be some justification for them. We should know the purposes of this organization.

As I see it, we are setting up an organization here not to supply food but to discuss food and international food questions. Apparently, while we are interested so much in the world's food supply, our own food supplies are daily growing shorter.

We believe that our Department of Agriculture knows best our food requirements and the things we need here. I am just factual enough to believe that that applies to all the other countries. Their customs, their foods, and their needs are different from ours. I believe they can find means within their own countries to solve their own problems if they want to.

Then, too, if, as the gentlewoman from Massachusetts said a moment ago, this is just to have a delegate sitting in, it seems to me the amount asked for is entirely too great—\$1,250,000 is too much. It should be cut to \$100,000. So I shall vote to cut the amount and finally for the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, certainly I am not one who is not interested in trying to help any people who are needy. I never was that way in all my life and I do not want to be classed as that now. But I do feel as a representative of 300,000 or 400,000 people that they want me to look after their interests as well as the interests of foreign nations. I am, however, for our people first, and if that be treason, then shoot, brother, shoot.

When we set up an organization here of 44 nations, and we get 1 vote, and we have to support the organization to the extent of 25 percent of the cost, I just wonder how far this can go on. The day of Santa Claus should be over. I realize that if this involved only \$5,000,000 it would not be worth my time to stand here and talk about it and object to the amount involved, but it is the principle of the thing that is important, a principle that we will have to consider in connection with many other bills that will be before the Congress before very long, and that is the amount the American Government is supposed to pay in proportion to the total amount of all the other nations of the world.

You can say it is mighty fine to have a Christian spirit and that you are going to help everybody. But when you obligate your people beyond your ability to pay then you do two things that are wrong:

First. You tax your people beyond their ability to pay.

Second. You make obligations to foreign countries that you cannot carry out; this they will condemn you for, not being as good as your word.

I am fearful of the things that this country of ours and a lot of people in this country are doing now in their promises to foreign nations of what they expect the United States to do and what they are going to obligate the United States to do in the future. Then later on they are not going to be able to fulfill those obligations, and they will come back on you—these foreign countries—and they will say, "America did not do what she promised to do, and they are nothing but a bunch of prevaricators over there; they do not carry out their word." You watch out and see if you are not getting yourself in that position. I am not going to obligate my people to something we cannot fulfill. I am not going to make promises to foreign countries which we are not going to be able to fulfill if I can keep from doing so. I am here to represent my people and keep them happy as well as all people of America.

When I read the report of this committee, I see in one statement here—

There has never been enough food for the health of all people. This is justified neither by ignorance nor by the harshness of nature. Production of food must be greatly expanded—

And so forth and so on.

Well, take our own Department of Agriculture today. We are not operating that way by any stretch of the imagination. We are paying out a billion dollars almost in subsidies to the farmers of this country right now. You did pay them



some years ago for not producing. We are taking money out of an empty Treasury, \$1,000,000,000 and more a year, and paying it to the farmers of the country when the people of this country have so much money they do not know what to do with it. And you are trying to keep the prices down instead of letting the farmer get a price for his commodities so that he will be paid the cost of production, including the cost of labor, which we ought to do and ought to do quickly if we are going to be sensible and if we are going to do the right thing for the farmers of this country. No; you are not doing that, but you reach down into the empty Treasury and take a billion dollars out of it and pay it out in subsidies. That means a wreck later for our farmers and the Treasury. And if you do not find out that our farmers are going to be sitting high and dry in a year or two, then I am greatly mistaken. They are going to be in terrible circumstances, and it is just the fault of such Congresses as we have had doing the things that the Congress has been doing for the last 6 or 8 years to the farmers of this country.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHAFER. Is it not true that there are 44 pages to this constitution, and we are expected to vote on it now after 1 hour of discussion?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I think so. I think the gentleman is right. However, it is not a question of how many pages but, rather, a question of what is in those pages. That is the thing I am fearful of: Is it good for the United States of America and our people?

Mr. SHAFER. Does not the gentleman think we ought to have more than 1 hour to discuss 44 pages of this constitution?

Mr. RICH. I think we ought to take a day to discuss it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am somewhat at a loss to know just how much I can say about this particular bill. I think it was discussed in executive session; I am not sure of it. I wish I were. At a morning session 2 years ago when the Committee on Foreign Affairs met with the Committee on Agriculture of the House to study these things, or to hear testimony on it, not to study it, we listened for some 1 hour and 20 minutes to an Assistant Secretary of State talking at that time about the needs of the world for food. It was wrapped in obscurity at that time and there was something mysterious about it. We could find out nothing about it. I suggested to the Secretary that he might make commitments at this clandestine meeting which they had at Hot Springs which we could not fill. Nobody seemed to worry about it except myself.

I realize that \$1,250,000 does not amount to anything to this spending Congress, and 50 times that much does not amount to anything, either in my committee or outside it, but I want to say

to all of you—and I cannot discuss it very fully because I may be breaking the confidence of an executive session—but I will say to you that this thing was conceived in mystery; it was discussed in darkness, and the result of it has come out of obscurity. I cannot find out anything more about it than the first time I heard about it. Like the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], I am afraid to look this gift horse in the mouth. I cannot get the conviction out of my mind that it is not tied up with this whole scheme of international do-gooding. I shall vote against the resolution, and I hope that a great many more will have the courage to do the same.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The inference was that there was something that should not be brought up on the floor of the House, because the matter was discussed in an executive session. I think somebody ought to be big enough to say what was happening in an executive session so that this Congress may know what is going on.

Mr. CLEVINGER. The gentleman was not in Congress, I think, when they had that meeting in Hot Springs, Va., and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] and the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, went down there and tried to jimmy their way into the meetings where the press were barred and where Members of Congress were barred. When a thing comes to me wrapped up in any sort of anonymity I shall not vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, I confess I am somewhat puzzled at the attitude that some of my colleagues in the House take on this bill. At one time or another back through the years I have had an opportunity to study some of these international agreements and treaties that have been submitted to the Congress of the United States. I think I can say without being contradicted that this is the simplest and most innocent one I have ever encountered. It is easiest to understand. It involves far less of obligation than any I have ever encountered and potentially it is the most valuable of any I have ever studied. There is no mystery about it whatsoever. I do not recollect any executive session at which the Foreign Affairs Committee discussed this matter. It was discussed in open sessions after extended hearings. All the motives and all the objectives involved in this proposal were brought to light and discussed and explained in the simplest of language. Every member of the committee, Democrat and Republican, made up his mind that this thing would be a good thing for the United States. We may have been unanimously wrong, but we were not moved by any secret or obscure motives.

Now about the simplicity of this thing, if I may enlarge upon that. When there came out of that Conference at Hot Springs this proposal which was submitted to all the nations which sent dele-

gates, of course a rough estimate had to be made as to what might be the cost of the maintenance annually if it were approved by a sufficient number of nations. The estimate was \$5,000,000 a year after the thing got started. Not as much as that the first year, because obviously the staff of the organization could not be recruited overnight and it could not get to work within the first fiscal year.

It was generally agreed by our people and other people that the nations would contribute to the Organization up to the extent of about \$5,000,000 a year in proportion to their wealth and their importance agriculturally; and it was agreed or suggested at that time that the proportion of the total expense, whatever it might be—and it was estimated not to exceed \$5,000,000, that the United States might pay not over 25 percent annually. That is much less than we are contributing to U. N. R. R. A., incidentally, less in proportion. If it is to cost less than \$5,000,000 a year our contribution will not have to be as high as \$1,250,000 a year. In no event can it go above \$1,250,000 a year; and if after 5 years of trying this thing we do not like it we can get out.

Never have I seen a proposal so simple, involving such light obligations submitted to the Congress of the United States in the form of an international agreement. I merely have this suggestion to make: That if an agreement of this kind cannot be endorsed and approved by the Congress of the United States, then none can.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked the distinguished gentleman from New York to yield was because I wanted to get the record straight. Our distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER] did not say that any secret meeting took place in the Foreign Affairs Committee. He was, however, stating a fact when he said that 2 years ago it was cloaked in a hush-hush atmosphere before the Agricultural Committee. At that time they surely did make a serious mistake by making believe that they had something under the shell that the people did not know about. That was unfortunate and their acts were responsible for getting this whole legislation off to a bad start. That mistake has nothing to do with the merits of the legislation. The mere fact that they came in here with a lot of super-duper ideas and they did not use any common sense in presenting the picture originally is no reason why we should not support the bill here today.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Did I misstate the fact when I said that I expressed concern to the Secretary of State at the time of those meetings?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman gave the facts, and he was the one Member at that time who wanted to be given a reason why if this thing was so good and if it had so much merit it had to be so secret.

They might have prevented misunderstanding, had the chairman and ranking minority members of the Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Agriculture been invited to the conference. We would not have had all the unfavorable publicity that conference received.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I said I should like to read some figures I have procured from the State Department regarding our contribution to the Organization for Food and Agriculture.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I make this statement first?

Mr. CHURCH. Will not the gentlewoman yield for a correction?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentlewoman mean 25 percent of our national income?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No. It is 25 percent of the total amount contributed to the Organization.

Mr. CHURCH. Then will the gentlewoman supply the break-down showing what use will be made of the \$1,250,000 a year? Is that a military secret?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No, it is not a military secret, but may I make a statement first? I will add the provisional total break-down later in my statement. I refer you, also, to page 41 of the constitution, a copy of which will be incorporated in this debate. The United States' contribution will be 25 percent of the total amount contributed to the constitution this year. The total income of the 44 nations in 1940 was between two hundred and two hundred and twenty-five billions of dollars. In 1940 the income of the United States was about \$75,000,000,000. The United States had more than one-third of the total income of the group, and yet it is contributing but 25 percent of the total amount to be contributed to this constitution.

In the committee the State Department gave me the break-down, and I thought it would be in the report. As a matter of fact, I did not know that this bill was coming up today. I was unable to be here on Friday.

All of the contributions from all countries will be used for salaries, for communications, for traveling expenses, for library, for correspondence, for publications, and the expenses necessary to hold the conferences. The following is the provisional estimate, or break-down, in the annual budget for the United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture for the first year. The exact budget for the constitution must be voted upon by the Commission.

DEC. 17, 1943.

Ordinary annual budget for the United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture for the first year

Chapter I. Council Conferences, and Committees: A. Council (2 sessions); B. Conferences (2); C. Other committees (scientific, economic, nutrition, etc. (10))— \$650,000

Chapter II. Inquiries, Missions, Correspondents, etc.: A. Regional Inquiries, Investigations, and Special Missions; B. Correspondents, temporary; collaborators, etc.	\$525,000
Chapter III. Salaries: Director General, 1 Deputy Director General; A. Principal officers (7); B. Heads of Divisions and Services (about 19); C. First Division Staff (175); D. Intermediate Staff (75); E. Other Staff (300)	2,017,500
Chapter IV. Other Staff Expenses: A. Allowances; B. Official travel; C. Travel expenses of staff between their homes and official stations; D. Staff retirement insurance; E. Staff health insurance	500,000
Chapter V. Maintenance: A. Office expenses: 1. Stationery and duplicating supplies; 2. Telephone, telegraph, and cable; 3. Postage; 4. Printing and publishing; 5. Library (current); 6. Unpaid liabilities fund—B. Building: 1. Rent, fuel, utilities; 2. Transport (delivery of documents, etc.); 3. Office furniture and equipment (upkeep); 4. Typewriters, calculating machines, etc. (upkeep); 5. Unpaid Liabilities Fund	667,500
Chapter VI. Miscellaneous and unforeseen, including supervision of revenue and expenditure: auditors' fees, subsistence, traveling allowances, etc.	60,000
Chapter VII. Working capital fund	270,000
Grand total	4,925,000

There is one safeguard in this constitution that is a considerable improvement over any safeguard in the agricultural institute, which, by the way, I voted against in the past because I felt it would be an Italian- or Fascist-controlled institution, which is just what it was. This organization will not be controlled by any one government. The seat will be selected by vote of the members of the commissions and I do not believe that any one country will dominate its proceedings. Conferences should be held in all countries, not just in one country. There shall not be more than one each from the different countries on the commission and they shall appoint an executive of not less than 9 or more than 15 members to guide the conference. The director general will be elected by the members of the commission but he will have no vote. I think there is a great safeguard in that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

We are spending billions of dollars to destroy property and kill people because we are engaged in a conflict that demands that sort of thing. Only last week we voted an additional appropriation of \$24,000,000,000 for the Navy Department without a roll-call vote, and almost without argument. For a decade before the war, we supplied Japan with 57 percent of her war materials to kill our Chinese brothers with. We provided some of our other adversaries tools and

equipment with which they and the Japanese have used to kill our boys.

Today we bellyache about appropriating a mere \$625,000 for a Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to stimulate the production of the right kinds of food, and in needed quantities, and also to provide the world with scientific knowledge about food and nourishment. In this initial effort of 44 nations in fighting ignorance and indifference, the United States Congress should give its approval without a murmur of opposition. We have spent considerable money and we have shed much blood to improve the conditions of mankind, and to carry out the Christian precepts which are outlined in the Sermon on the Mount, and to which most Americans subscribe. Most of us are familiar with a hymn that we enjoy singing in our churches, it is:

From Greenland's icy mountains, from India's coral strand,

Where Afric's sunny fountains roll down their golden sand;

From many an ancient river, from many a palmy plain,

They call us to deliver their land from error's chain.

What though the spicy breezes blow soft o'er Ceylon's Isle;

Though every prospect pleases, and only man is vile.

In vain, with lavish kindness, the gifts of God are strown;

The heathen, in his blindness, bows down to wood and stone.

Can we, whose souls are lighted by wisdom from on high,

Can we to men benighted the lamp of life deny?

Salvation! Oh salvation! the joyful sound proclaim,

Till earth's remotest nation has learned Messiah's name.

Waft, waft, ye winds, His story, and you, ye waters roll,

Till, like a sea of glory, it spreads from pole to pole.

Till o'er our ransomed nature the Lamb, for sinners slain,

Redeemer, King, Creator, in bliss returns to reign.

Here is an evidence of practical Christianity. We will have freedom from war if we provide freedom from want. If we fail to pass a piece of legislation like this, for a truly constructive job, we might just as well scrap all the hymn books in the churches of America.

The Methodist Church is now conducting a crusade for Christ. There are many Methodists on the floor of this House who know what I am talking about. Hundreds of thousands of dollars—millions, in fact, are being contributed to help the people—not only Americans, but citizens of the world—of every race and color and creed.

Today my own wife is working in Cleveland on a clothing drive. They are gathering clothing from every home in that community to send to the ill-clad everywhere throughout the world. Something has been said about the do-gooders. Your wife and my wife are do-gooders back home. They subscribe to a Christian and American doctrine. Let us in turn apply it here.



This is no time for narrow provincialism. If you will read the testimony on this issue given by Mr. O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau Federation, before the Foreign Relations Committee; if you will also read the testimony of Raymond Gram Swing, one of the most conservative radio commentators in America—you will become more convinced than ever that we should spend the \$625,000 for the first year and the \$1,250,000 for ensuing years for the 5-year period.

I know that Americans are disposed to view with suspicion and alarm anything that is initiated overseas, but here are 44 countries providing the first international agreement to have emerged from this war, pledging themselves to a program which will raise their food and nutrition standards—a program the like of which has never before been known in the history of mankind. They are setting up a fund of \$5,000,000 a year for 5 years, to campaign against ignorance and indifference. They agree to report each year to the other nations, precisely what has been done to make good on this pledge.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my colleague, the industrious gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. We have been buying wars with our blood and our dollars, and if we can now buy peace only with our dollars, it will be a good bargain, will it not?

Mr. BENDER. My good friend from Ohio is absolutely right. Here is the beginning of a program to beat some of our guns into plowshares. This is just a beginning. I am sure it will provide our friends in San Francisco with the kind of inspiration that is needed there.

Washington, like every other capital, is so close to the international forest that it sometimes loses sight of the wood in the maze of trees. Foreign policy is so delicately poised these days that sensitive, oversensitive Government departments magnify whispers into full-blown attacks. Equally, every happy omen becomes a source of the greatest joy, no matter how uncorroborated it may be.

In this atmosphere, it is vitally important for the men and women upon whose shoulders final responsibility must rest to retain their balance, their good judgment, their recognition of the major objectives. We must never lose sight of the goal. Minor disagreements, affronts to our national prestige, incidents, diplomatic protocol, all these elements sometimes obscure our vision. Disputes over boundary lines, exchanges of populations, representation at San Francisco, voting methods—each of these is a matter of great moment. None of them can be permitted to alter the basic determination of our people to establish a better world, in which our constant protestations that we cherish peace are translated into reality.

Russia and Great Britain, China and France, are alternatively praised and denounced for their international conduct in our press. Let us not forget that we, too, are equally lauded and condemned in the daily journals of our allies. These are the processes of intelligent thinking,

Magnified, our differences of opinion may appear to be crucial. Yet when we remember that we have overcome far more serious disagreements of viewpoint in the interest of our common cause, we can look forward with renewed courage and optimism in the building of a lasting world peace. Men of good will can accomplish this result. Men of good will in every land demand nothing less.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am like the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in that I am amazed at the attitude of some of the members of the committee with regard to this proposal and particularly at the ideas that have been expressed here that this is such a very complicated proposition. We have it all right here before us. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] a little while ago made the statement, which I am sure he made inadvertently, that there were 44 pages to the constitution of this Organization. I am sure that if he had looked at the copy which is available here to every one he would have seen there were only 9 pages to the constitution, in large print at that, and that the powers and functions of this Organization as set out in this constitution comprise less than 1 page. They are all right here in large print so that everyone who runs may read, and there is nothing in those functions to which I can see any objection.

If we cannot get together on a little, simple proposition like this, then the Conference out in San Francisco might just as well fold up and we might as well give up the idea of any international agreements because this is the simplest and the mildest and, to my way of thinking, the broadest agreement that could possibly be made. It is broad because it is an agreement affecting the farmers of the world, and two-thirds of the people on this earth are farmers. If it did not do anything else except offer an opportunity for the farmers of the world through their representatives to get together and exchange ideas, and talk over their problems, it would be money well spent. But the proposition is broader than that: we are all interested in food. It is a subject upon which the whole world can get together. An organization such as this is worth the insignificant sum that it is going to cost, if it did not do anything except afford an opportunity to get together. I believe it will do more than that, a great deal more. I do not want to ask you to take my own word for it. At the hearings on the bill President Edward A. O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared in support of the same. Something has been said here about the farmers of this country being adversely affected by an agreement of this kind. Mr. O'Neal was there. He did not agree with that sentiment.

Others representing agriculture were there. They were unanimous in their support of this proposal.

This is what Mr. O'Neal said:

On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I wish to testify in favor of the participation of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

He goes on and enumerates seven reasons why he thinks this will be helpful to the farmers. The first one is this:

This organization is another step in international cooperation. It is imperative that this Nation take the leadership in developing means of cooperation among all nations of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. The second reason given by Mr. O'Neal is as follows:

Much will be gained by the Food and Agriculture Organization sponsoring the exchange of research material and technical skills. Scientific facts developed in one part of the world are often useful to scientists elsewhere, yet the hurdles of space, custom, and language often prevent a free exchange of information.

To my mind, that is one of the most important functions of this organization.

The third reason is:

This international food organization should provide a means of calling together representatives of organized farmers throughout the world.

I have already mentioned that.

The fourth is:

One of the most significant contributions such an international food and agriculture organization can make is the development of better statistical data and economic research on a world-wide basis.

I know, because I have tried to get the information, that we do not have available statistics in a great many fields today. For instance, on a subject as important as wheat, a crop that is grown in practically every country in the world, we cannot get statistics today showing the world-wide production of wheat, because we have no statistics from China or Russia, and have never had. That is merely one illustration of our lack of statistical information.

This is Mr. O'Neal's fifth point:

The Organization can be helpful in developing international policies with respect to agricultural commodity agreements.

In my opinion, that will be a most important subject in the future. We are talking about possible surpluses after the war. If we want to protect American agriculture, I do not know of anything that can be done which is more constructive than international commodity agreements with reference to surpluses. I mean agreements not only among the surplus-producing nations but with the importing nations as well in an effort to seek wider markets. That is an opportunity of which this organization will enable us to take advantage.

Mr. O'Neal's sixth point is:

The Organization could do much to promote better agricultural credit throughout the world.

The seventh point is:

The Food and Agriculture Organization can improve the well-being of mankind. If

America has anything to teach the nations in which living standards are low, certainly we will all agree that the most helpful thing we can teach them is the technology of production which has been largely responsible for lifting our standards far above those generally prevailing throughout the world.

Today two-thirds of the people of this world are undernourished. Undernourishment has been this world's greatest problem since time began. Setting up this Organization is a constructive step toward a solution of this problem. We can do no less than make this start.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when legislation of this character is brought before the House, there are some people who always have to raise a calamity howl. They do not seem to have any faith in the leadership or destiny of the United States of America. The point has been brought out that under this agreement the United States would only have one vote. But I want to call the attention of the membership that that one vote of the United States is the only one which can bind this Government to anything. The same was true of the late League of Nations. It was true in our articles of confederation which joined the United Colonies and it was due to that fact that we now have in the Constitution of the United States our Bill of Rights. I am not afraid for the United States because we have only one vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed \$1,250,000 annually, as may be required for expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of State, for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share in the expenses of the organization.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, beginning in line 3, after the word "appropriated", strike out "such sums, not to exceed \$1,250,000 annually", and insert the words "a sum not exceeding \$625,000 during the first fiscal year of the organization and sums not exceeding \$1,250,000 annually thereafter."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the word "exceeding", strike out "\$625,000" and insert "\$200,000."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to the committee amendment and ask unanimous consent that both amendments to the committee amendment be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "exceeding", strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$400,000."

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the San Francisco Conference resolution and the Dumbarton Oaks resolution are part and parcel of the same international scheme to prevent war and to preserve peace, and they are related and not unrelated. I hope that today in the House in the consideration of this resolution we will not turn back to the god of isolationism but that we will realize that the world has grown so small by reason of science—

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not now; I will yield later.

Mr. Chairman, we must realize that the world now is so small that the United States cannot stand alone; we cannot live alone, but we are dependent upon the other nations of the world, and unless there is international cooperation to preserve peace there will be another war. The next time we will not be able to keep the war from our own shores as we have in the past. The development of science, the robot plane and bomb, is such now that our enemies can fire them all the way across the Atlantic. The next war will actually reach our own shores, destroy our own homes and firesides and the lives of our people. We must stand united in time of peace to preserve peace as we have in time of war to win the war.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I must first yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I had hoped the gentleman would say something about the taxpayers of the United States.

The gentleman does not get my position exactly correct. I am for this organization, but we have had no information as to how many people are to be employed, what salaries they are to receive, what expenses they may incur. So I have offered my amendment to cut the amount the first year to \$200,000 and in subsequent years to \$400,000.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In reply to the gentleman and getting down to the question of figures, as I explained in the remarks I made a little while ago, the exact amount of the appropriations will be determined by the Committee on Appropriations. This bill simply authorizes the maximum amount, setting it at \$1,250,000.

On page 10 of the hearings will be found a break-down with reference to the amount that shall be assessed against all of the governments. We do not appropriate anything in this bill. We may not appropriate anything. The Appropriations Committee may not appropriate. The Congress will have to appropriate this money. As was stated by someone with reference to the Institute at Rome, some years we did not appropriate anything and finally we quit appropriating altogether. The Appropriations Committee will require a break-down.

Someone asked what this money is going to be spent for. I have secured

this information and I can furnish it now. All of the money will be spent for administrative expenses. Someone asked, will it include salaries only? Of course, salaries will be one of the large items, but there will also be traveling expenses, there will be expenses for the conferences that are held, there will be expenses for the communications. All of those items are administrative expenses. That has been considered by these 44 nations and the amount necessary has been worked out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things I want to say to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee with reference to certain matters that have been said here this afternoon, and the sooner they take this to heart the better off they will be. When a committee comes in here and its members are asked what they are going to do with the money and they make no answer, a cloud is being thrown around the legislation. That is what this committee has done. The members have been asked what they are going to do with the money and reference has been made to a break-down on pages 9 and 10 of the hearings, but there is no break-down there.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. This legislation only authorizes. Will it not be incumbent upon a committee subsequently to fix the amount of the expenditures to be authorized?

Mr. TABER. That is true. On the other hand, it should not be done in an outlandish way.

Frankly, I cannot see, and I do not believe anyone else can see, how the type of activity covered by this resolution could consume any such amount of money as is set up here. When we make an authorization for 2, 3, 4, 5, or 10 times what ought to be spent, we are bringing discredit upon ourselves and upon the committee which proposes the legislation. Instead of being advocates of international cooperation, when the Foreign Affairs Committee takes that attitude, it is opposed to international cooperation. That is the honest truth. Unless the members of that committee come in here and are frank with us in answering questions, they are making a great mistake and are not contributing to international cooperation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Following the other war we had many proposals before the Congress to go into these organizations. Those proposals kept piling up until finally the Congress absolutely had to quit. If you keep piling these things up now, one of these days the Congress will have to quit.

Mr. TABER. I have seen many things brought in here heretofore by which the international affairs of this country and our cooperation with foreign countries



have been hurt by overdoing certain things.

I want to see us begin to do things right on top of the table. Open it right up. That is what the trouble with this picture is, and that is why I am in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSON].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does he not think that the authorization should be entirely adequate to cover the legitimate expenses?

Mr. TABER. Yes, but no one can understand how they could be more than \$125,000 a year for legitimate expenses. The gentleman from Kentucky is proposing as high as \$400,000 when it has been suggested that it should not run more than \$125,000. There has been no explanation from the committee that would justify anybody getting any higher. Now that is the trouble with the picture, and unless we have frankness and honesty in approaching our dealings in foreign affairs, we are not promoting international cooperation, and that is just exactly the position that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is in as they stand here now.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman certainly realizes that we have difficulty in anticipating accurately the amount of money actually needed. But the gentleman is on the Committee on Appropriations and certainly his committee will require a proper showing to be made at the proper time.

Mr. TABER. I hope so, but I do not like to see authorizations passed in an outlandish fashion.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman will recall that in talking about the Committee on Foreign Affairs on figures, and the Committee on Appropriations, when we had the lend-lease bill up, the gentleman was anxious, when I was speaking, that I give him a breakdown of what it was going to cost, and the gentleman will remember very well what I said to him, that his committee dealt with figures and our committee dealt with policies. Future events indicated that I was right; that we could not have figured the amount that lend-lease would cost.

With reference to this matter I would like to ask the gentleman, who is a level-headed man, and a man for whose judgment I have the highest regard, and who has saved the country a lot of money, this question: Who does he think could come nearest estimating the amount of money necessary? Nobody knows in advance what it is going to cost. Who does he think would come nearer estimating the amount that will be needed; these men who have been studying this problem and spending weeks and months at it, or the gentleman from Kentucky, who rises and offers an amendment without knowing anything whatever about what it is going to cost?

Mr. TABER. When we have this situation that we are asking a great com-

mittee which has held hearings on this subject to justify an item, and they come in here with no justification whatever, we are justified in assuming that some of the things that some of us have felt with reference to it are correct and that these estimates are outlandish. I would like to see the thing justified if you are going to ask for that amount of money.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the amendment for which the gentleman from New York has just been speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I asked that the amendment be again reported for which the gentleman from New York has just spoken because in his lecture to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs he suggested that we give reasons why the figure of \$625,000 was correct rather than the figure proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky. May I say first of all that I am glad the gentleman from New York undertook to lecture the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I think all committees of the House occasionally need suggestions and criticism and counsel from Congressmen who are not members of those committees. I, for example, have some criticisms to make of the manner in which the Committee on Appropriations conducts some of its business. I welcome the precedent for having Members outside of the committee ask questions and offer criticism and give counsel to different committees. I think that is salutary procedure. Someday I shall emulate it by discussing the procedures and policies of the Appropriations Committee, of which the gentleman from New York is the able ranking member.

To answer his question specifically, however, I have only to point to the fact that on page 9, if the gentleman will turn to the hearings, under article VI, it is provided in the agreement that the provisional budget for the first financial year shall be the sum of \$2,500,000, the unspent balance of which shall constitute the nucleus of the capital fund.

On the next page it points out that the share the United States should pay is 25 percent, and 25 percent of that figure is \$625,000. That gives us the figure which is asked for the first year.

You could ask for no more complete justification for that amount of appropriation, provided you are in favor of this cooperative plan. If you are opposed to the plan, one way in which to criticize it, of course, would be to attack it by decreasing the amount of money we contribute and, therefore, throwing the entire agreement out of balance.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. May I ask the gentleman whether or not, in calculating the amount each country should contribute, Russia,

Canada, and the Argentine were taken into consideration? I notice that Russia has not signed the agreement up to date, and neither has Canada. I do not believe the United Kingdom has signed it. I do not think Argentina is even a member of the organization yet. My point is, Were those nations taken into consideration in calculating the amount; and, if so, how does the gentleman know they are going to come in? Those are some of the things I want to know about.

Mr. MUNDT. All the nations who are participating are listed on page 10, with the specific percentage contribution that each makes. Obviously, any country whose name is not found opposite a percentage is not making a contribution. If and when it does join the organization, when a new budget is arrived at, it will be assigned a percentage which it has to underwrite. At the present time those not participating in the conference are not contributing to its counsel; they are not participating in its benefits, and they are not underwriting any portion of the expense. The entire 100-percent contribution is listed on page 10 with the percentage of expense each participating nation has agreed to underwrite.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. On page 10, to which the gentleman refers, appears the Union of South Africa, 2.31 percent; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 8 percent; United Kingdom, 15 percent; and United States of America, 25 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. Right. It is all listed right there.

Mr. CHURCH. The United States has the largest percentage of all these listed.

Mr. MUNDT. It has the largest percentage because it has the largest and most important agricultural industry. I sincerely believe it will benefit the most from the agreement.

I have been interested in some of the arguments advanced both pro and con this afternoon. Out West where the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] and I live, we have the statement that sometimes we see a lot of gun play but very little shooting. I think that has been the case here today. There has been a lot of gun play beside the issue, but very little shooting at the target.

For example, we have heard discussed at considerable length whether or not we should adopt this resolution because the Hot Springs food conference was held in secrecy. I was one of those who decried the fact that it was held in secrecy. I deplore that now, but I see no reason to condemn this resolution and this proposal, which is out in the open, because the first food conference was unwisely held in secrecy.

We have heard it argued, on the other hand, that by all means we should adopt this resolution because the San Francisco Conference is in session, and because unless we can agree on this which is simple we cannot agree on anything which might be more complicated.

I think this resolution should be considered on its own merits and stand on its own bottom, and be accepted or disagreed to in accordance with its own text

and what it does. I am willing to support this resolution because of what it does, because it is a good resolution. I would not be here advocating a bad resolution on the argument that unless we accept a bad resolution the San Francisco Conference might not succeed. I think it is not going to wreck the San Francisco Conference if we defeat it and it is not going to insure the success of the San Francisco Conference if we approve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. The point I am trying to stress is that I believe this resolution is good enough to warrant your approval of it of, as, and by itself. I think the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations can achieve much good regardless of what else does or does not come out of the San Francisco Conference.

The third argument which I think has been advanced here is whether we should go in for \$625,000 a year or \$400,000 or \$200,000. It has been decided by the participants that if we go in at all we go in for 25 percent. If we go in at all, we go in for \$625,000. Therefore, let us argue the issue: Should we or should we not go in at all? I think we should.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The figure of \$2,500,000 is set forth on page 9 of the hearings as a part of the agreement, but is it not an absolutely arbitrary figure? There is nothing anywhere in the hearings that governs, controls, or indicates what the charge should be for the rest of the period which the agreement might be in effect. That is true, is it not?

Mr. MUNDT. It is true that it is an arbitrary figure based on the estimate arrived at by the international conferees as interpreted by the committee. It is true, too, that on page 2 of the bill, the limit is specifically set in that it states it will not cost more than \$1,250,000 annually. So the ceiling as to what the Organization can spend is four times that or \$5,000,000 per year. That is the top. That is clear. That is specifically established.

Mr. TABER. There is nothing set up at all in the agreement itself as to how much the future ceiling or any other contribution might be.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; there is. It is set, if we pass this bill, at \$5,000,000 because we specifically declare that to be the limit by our action in setting our ceiling contribution at \$1,250,000.

Mr. TABER. There is nothing in the hearings to support the \$5,000,000 anywhere.

Mr. MUNDT. That limit would be set at \$5,000,000 if we passed the bill, inasmuch as we are to contribute not exceeding \$1,250,000 annually as our 25 percent of the total budget for the Organization.

Mr. TABER. There is nothing in the hearings on that.

Mr. MUNDT. The hearings do not govern this legislation, as the gentleman knows. The text of the bill determines the policy of Congress. What the committee determined after the hearings, acting for the Congress, is that our top limit is a contribution of \$1,250,000 per year.

Mr. TABER. The Congress asks for support in the hearings for the policy that is adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. After listening to all of the testimony and carefully consulting with the witnesses, the committee determined that \$1,250,000 was the correct top figure. If the gentleman's Appropriation Committee decides to reduce that, it is, of course, within the province of his committee if it cares to assume the attendant responsibility.

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. One of the main objections I have is to this arbitrary amount.

Mr. MUNDT. It is no more arbitrary than the amount which the gentleman from Kentucky suggested.

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. Yes; it is because you do not state how many people are going to be employed, what officers, and what salaries. There is no evidence to give the House, anything upon which to base this \$5,000,000.

Mr. MUNDT. It is impossible to state that in an infant organization which is growing up any more than we can state what damage the Japanese corn borer is going to cause in the State of Ohio and how many people are going to be required to investigate it. We do not know what the problems are going to be until the organization and the Conference have had an opportunity to function for a while.

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman say that in their hearings the committee did not develop what this money is to be spent for and who is to get it and what the salaries were going to be, and so forth? I think that should have been done.

Mr. MUNDT. It is impossible in setting up a new organization to determine those matters specifically except to make an estimate. This estimate was arrived at by the international conferees as interpreted by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The top limit has been established at \$1,250,000 per year. That makes the total for organization purposes of \$5,000,000 per year unless additional countries join or the budget is changed. To increase our contribution would require another act by Congress.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What does the gentleman from South Dakota propose to do with this \$1,250,000?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad that the gentleman has asked that question. That is certainly a basic question and it is fundamental. Obviously, it is not what I propose to do or what our Committee on Foreign Affairs proposes to do nor

what the American representatives propose to do, but rather what the Organization proposes to do that is pertinent. I will explain what is likely to be done with it, however.

The purposes and the functions of the Organization are set forth on pages 1 and 2 of the hearings. Let me point out how I think the United States could benefit. We have heard a lot about food production. We are a surplus food producing Nation. But in this organization attention is also to be given to the nutritive habits and nutritive needs of the peoples of the world, and anything which can be done to expand consumption, for example, in China, of wheat, is of direct benefit to the United States.

Not only in China but in many other countries, native citizens have not been in the habit of eating bread made from wheat. Anything done to increase the use of wheat in these countries can prove beneficial to American agriculture since we are a great producer of wheat. Likewise, increases in the use of cotton for clothes will reflect themselves favorably upon our cotton producers. The greater the demands of the outside world for the products of American farms, the more likelihood there is that our farmers will annually receive a fair price for a full crop from their farms. In this way the United States stands to benefit economically from membership in an international organization of this type.

What is true of the United States is true, also, of other great producing nations. Take Brazil for example, which has indicated its intention of participation in this Organization. When and if the peoples of countries where coffee is not now consumed to great extent take up coffee drinking, the product of the Brazilian coffee plantations will bring additional revenue. China might be interested in seeing the use of tea expanded; and so it goes.

However, Mr. Chairman, much of the world still lives on a submarginal level insofar as food is concerned. In many countries, the problem is not that of encouraging people to consume more and to use a greater variety of food products, but it is a problem of getting enough to eat. Here an organization of this type can be helpful in extending scientific agricultural advice and in advocating improved methods of soil utilization and conservation. By helping to stabilize the basic food production, an organization such as this can aid people to become more vigorous and more prosperous and thus equip them to use more of the world's products whether taken from farm or factory. Hunger is a great breeder of discontent and of evil. By helping the world to cure the plague of hunger we also help the world to discourage the likelihood of war.

Let us vote down the proposed crippling amendment and take our rightful place in this organization determined to exercise leadership in the world's plans to eliminate hunger and to improve the nutritive habits of its people. This is not charity or relief, Mr. Chairman. Like many of you, I have little faith in the philosophy which believes the United States can purchase permanent peace or buy enduring friendships by the device



of recklessly spreading our financial resources all over the world. I believe, instead, that we might well run out of finances and find ourselves insolvent and impotent before we were able to go very far or achieve very much of permanent value by trying to put American dollars in the pockets of people who have not yet learned to wear clothes.

However, this proposal is one which is designed to help the world to help itself. In this organization we take our part as a leader in the world's agricultural activities in an effort to prevent distress, disease, and distrust through enabling the peoples of the world to have enough to eat and encouraging them to improve and expand their diets to the end that farmers everywhere will find a more ready and profitable market for their products. I hope the House will approve this resolution and that it will do so without reducing the appropriation to a point where the new organization will be unable to function. I ask for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, insert:

"Sec. 3. In adopting this joint resolution, it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should use its best efforts to bring about, as soon as practicable, the integration of the functions and the resources of the International Institute of Agriculture with those of the Organization, in a legal and orderly manner, to effect one united institution in such form as to provide an adequate research, informational, and statistical service for the industry of agriculture."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States accept any amendment under paragraph 1 of article XX of the Constitution of the Organization involving any new obligation for the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "3" and insert "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the understanding that paragraph 2 of article XIII does not authorize the Conference of the Organization to so modify the provisions of its Constitution as to involve any new obligation for the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 24, strike out "4" and insert "5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman, of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 145, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 291, nays 25, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—291

Abernethy	Clason	Gamble
Adams	Coffee	Gardner
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Mo.	Gary
Allen, La.	Cole, N. Y.	Gathings
Anderson, Calif.	Colmer	Gearhart
Andrews, Ala.	Combs	Geelan
Andrews, N. Y.	Cooley	Gibson
Angell	Cooper	Gillespie
Arends	Courtney	Gillie
Arnold	Cox	Goodwin
Auchincloss	Cravens	Gordon
Bailey	Crawford	Gore
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cunningham	Gossett
Barden	Curtis	Granahan
Barrett, Pa.	D'Alesandro	Granger
Barrett, Wyo.	Daughton, Va.	Grant, Ala.
Bates, Ky.	De Lacy	Grant, Ind.
Bates, Mass.	Delaney,	Green
Bell	John J.	Gregory
Bender	Dingell	Griffiths
Biemiller	Dolliver	Gross
Blackney	Domengeaux	Gwynne, Iowa
Bland	Dondero	Hagen
Bolton	Doughton, N. C.	Hale
Bonner	Douglas, Calif.	Hall,
Bradley, Pa.	Douglas, Ill.	Edwin Arthur
Brehm	Doyle	Hare
Brooks	Drewry	Harris
Brown, Ga.	Dworshak	Hartley
Bryson	Earthman	Havener
Buck	Elliot	Hays
Bulwinkle	Ellsworth	Hebert
Bunker	Engel, Mich.	Hedrick
Burch	Engle, Calif.	Hendricks
Burgin	Ervin	Henry
Byrne, N. Y.	Fallon	Heselton
Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan	Hess
Camp	Fellows	Hill
Cannon, Mo.	Fenton	Hinschaw
Carlson	Fernandez	Hoch
Carnahan	Fisher	Hoeven
Case, N. J.	Flannagan	Hollfield
Chapman	Fogarty	Holmes, Wash.
Chelf	Folger	Holmes
Chenoweth	Forand	Hope
Chipperfield	Fuller	Horan
Church	Gallagher	Howell

Huber	Merrow	Sasscer
Jennings	Michener	Schwabe, Mo.
Jensen	Miller, Calif.	Scrivner
Johnson, Calif.	Miller, Nebr.	Shaffer
Johnson, Ill.	Mills	Sharp
Johnson, Ind.	Monroney	Sheppard
Johnson,	Morrison	Sikes
Luther A.	Mundt	Simpson, Ill.
Johnson,	Murdock	Simpson, Pa.
Lyndon B.	Murray, Tenn.	Slaughter
Johnson, Okla.	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Maine
Jonkman	Neely	Smith, Va.
Judd	Norrell	Smith, Wis.
Kean	Norton	Snyder
Kearney	O'Brien, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.
Kee	O'Brien, Mich.	Sparkman
Keefe	O'Neal	Spence
Kelly, Ill.	O'Toole	Springer
Kerr	Outland	Starkey
Kilday	Patman	Stefan
King	Patrick	Stigler
Kinzer	Patterson	Stockman
Knutson	Peterson, Fla.	Sullivan
Kopplemann	Peterson, Ga.	Summers, Tex.
LaFollette	Phillips	Talbot
Landis	Pickett	Talle
Lanham	Poage	Tarver
Larcade	Price, Fla.	Taylor
Latham	Price, Ill.	Thom
Lea	Priest	Thomas, Tex.
LeCompte	Rabaut	Tibbott
LeFevre	Ramey	Tolan
Link	Ramspeck	Trimble
Ludlow	Randolph	Vinson
Lyle	Rankin	Voorhis, Calif.
Lynch	Rayfield	Vursell
McConnell	Reece, Tenn.	Wadsworth
McCormack	Rees, Kans.	Wasslewski
McDonough	Rea	Weaver
McGlinchey	Riley	Welch
McGregor	Rivers	Whitten
McMillan, S. C.	Robertson,	Whittington
McMillen, Ill.	N. Dak.	Wickersham
Madden	Robertson, Va.	Wigglesworth
Mahon	Robinson, Utah	Winstead
Mansfield,	Rockwell	Wolcott
Mont.	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mansfield, Tex.	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Marcantonio	Rogers, N. Y.	Wood
Martin, Iowa	Rowan	Woodhouse
Martin, Mass.	Russell	Woodrum, Va.
May	Sabath	Zimmerman

NAYS—25

Andersen,	Hull	Rich
H. Carl	Jenkins	Rizley
Beall	Jones	Robison, Ky.
Bishop	Lewis	Schwabe, Okla.
Clevenger	O'Hara	Smith, Ohio
Ellis	O'Konski	Sumner, Ill.
Elston	Pittenger	Taber
Harness, Ind.	Reed, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—116

Anderson,	Flood	Morgan
N. Mex.	Fulton	Mott
Andresen,	Gavin	Murphy
August H.	Gerlach	Pace
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Pfeifer
Barry	Gillette	Philbin
Beckworth	Gorski	Ploeser
Bennet, N. Y.	Graham	Plumley
Bennett, Mo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Powell
Bloom	Hall,	Powers
Boren	Leonard W.	Quinn, N. Y.
Boykin	Halleck	Rabin
Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Rains
Brown, Ohio	Hand	Richards
Brumbaugh	Harless, Ariz.	Roe, Md.
Buckley	Hart	Roe, N. Y.
Buffett	Healy	Rogers, Fla.
Butler	Heffernan	Rooney
Campbell	Herter	Ryter
Canfield	Hobbs	Sadowski
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Mass.	Savage
Case, S. Dak.	Izac	Sheridan
Celler	Jackson	Short
Clark	Jarman	Stevenson
Clements	Kefauver	Stewart
Cochran	Kelley, Pa.	Sundstrom
Cole, Kans.	Keogh	Thomas, N. J.
Corbett	Kilburn	Thomason
Crosser	Kirwan	Torrens
Curley	Kunkel	Towe
Davis	Lane	Traynor
Dawson	Lemke	Vorys, Ohio
Delaney,	Lesinski	Walter
James J.	Luce	Weiss
Dickstein	McCowan	Welch
Dirksen	McGehee	West
Durham	McKenzie	White
Eaton	Maloney	Wilson
Eberhart	Manasco	Winter
Elsaesser	Mason	Worley

So the resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

**General pairs:**

Mr. Barry with Mr. Short.  
Mr. Monasco with Mr. Eaton.  
Mr. James J. Delaney with Mr. Brumbaugh.  
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Mason.  
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Bennett of Missouri.  
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Winter.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Ploeser.  
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Fulton.  
Mr. Healy with Mr. Dirksen.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Canfield.  
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gifford.  
Mr. Davis with Mr. Sundstrum.  
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Graham.  
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Towe.  
Mr. Hart with Mr. Plumley.  
Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Luce.  
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.  
Mr. Pfeiffer with Mr. Hancock.  
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gavin.  
Mr. Quinn of New York with Mr. Butler.  
Mr. Rabin with Mr. Herter.  
Mr. Lane with Mr. Welch.  
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Powers.  
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Buffett.  
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Case of South Dakota.  
Mr. Torrens with Mr. August H. Andresen.  
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Wilson.  
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Stevenson.  
Mr. Izac with Mr. McCowen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GERMAN ATROCITY PICTURES**

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I made an announcement about the Pathe News pictures of the German atrocities to be shown in the Senate Office Building. I desire to announce that on tomorrow morning in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building the pictures will be shown at 10:45 o'clock. The Speaker has made arrangements for this, and I am announcing it so that the Members may be aware of the fact.

**POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY**

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour set aside and controlled by me on Thursday, May 3, Polish Constitution Day, be extended to 1 hour and 15 minutes, to be controlled by my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RYTER] and that this time, by agreement with my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] shall supersede the time reserved for himself on that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on my bill, House Joint Resolution 131.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include an address by Mr. McClellan Vandever at Birmingham.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances and to include therein two short editorials from a Long Beach paper.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the State legislature of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

**GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 145, PROVIDING FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks upon the bill just passed and that I and other Members may be allowed to revise and extend the remarks they made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. PETE JARMAN, may be granted a leave of absence for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

**SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS—PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT**

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Claims, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report (Rept. No. 237) on the bill H. R. 2068 to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of

the Army for damages to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

**THE F. E. P. C. BILL**

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to section 9 (a) found on page 10 of H. R. 2232. It reads as follows:

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against relating to any such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members of the House who intend to vote for F. E. P. C. get a copy of that bill and read that language. Simplified it is this—and do not forget that all of the agents who are now in the employ of F. E. P. C. are continued in their jobs if this bill is adopted. Any one of those agents will have authority to go into the business place, the office, the plant of any one of your constituents and make such examination as he may deem necessary—any one of those agents.

And do not forget, 59 percent of them are from one racial group. They will have authority to go into a plant in your district, examine the books and the files—something the United States marshal cannot do until he has obtained a search warrant after evidence produced—examine those files and give the information he finds there to a business competitor. You cannot get away from it. No such grant of power was ever made by any legislative act of this Congress or any other Congress.

Now, the next section:

(b) Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

I suppose that would include the islands that our fighting men have just taken.

Now, think of this: The Commission has the power to appoint its agents, and I hope the constitutional lawyer over here will take this into consideration. I know he is familiar with this law. When he wakes up at night I hope he will turn it over in his mind and see what a monstrous thing this is. Any agent of this



Commission may go to any part of the country, issue a subpoena and send it to any part of the United States and require the attendance of a witness and his books and papers at any other place where that agent may be sitting or where he wants to go. He may, for instance, send a subpoena out to the Philippine Islands or anywhere else in the world where America is in possession of property or land and make that witness come, if it is in the summertime, to Maine, and if it is in the wintertime down to Miami, Fla. Is that not a fine, fine grant of power, of tyranny, if you please, to place in the hands of a group which from the date of its appointment by the President has practiced discrimination, as shown by its own records?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. That is more power than any Federal judge now has?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is more power than all the Federal judges have and all of the United States marshals. No one in our Government can do that kind of thing.

Just look how this throws the doors open to the exercise of tyranny. If you do not obey, then they will hale you before a Federal court. What will they do to you?

Here is another section over here, and I hope my good friends on the Republican side who intend to vote for this will get the import of it. If you interfere in any way with one of these agents, what happens? You are subject to a fine of \$5,000 and a year's imprisonment. You are guilty of a felony. In other words, my good friend, William Powers Maloney, socked this representative of China out here on the street. If that Chinaman had been an appointee of the F. E. P. C., instead of getting a \$10 fine for disorderly conduct, William Powers Maloney would have had to go to jail for a year or would have been subject to a \$5,000 fine if the judge thought that was the way to do it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. If the gentleman is as far afield in the rest of his argument as he is in the last argument he made with regard to Mr. Maloney, he is certainly far afield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman for the correction, and I assure him I will not withdraw any of it, which has been the experience of the gentleman from Michigan, my delightful colleague. I will read the section to him:

SEC. 13. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

I did make a mistake. I just referred to one of them, but there are two, a \$5,000 fine and jail.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOK. I still claim the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know it does not make any difference to the gentleman. When he is corrected, he always lets it stand until some action is taken to expunge it. The gentleman may read the bill himself.

Mr. Speaker, the House has been in session quite a while, and there are other gentlemen who want to speak. This is a sample of what this bill contains.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is talking about all these fines and penalties. This is setting up a totalitarian government with all the powers that Mussolini ever had in Italy. Of course, it is far reaching and destructive of every man in business that this outfit wants to destroy.

I am going to ask that the gentleman insert the copy of the bill at the close of his remarks so that the Members of the House can read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will. I will insert it in connection with my remarks earlier in the day.

There is plenty in this bill that shows it is designed for the purpose—well, let each Member form his own opinion.

In talking about this bill I have two things in mind. I want to call to the attention of my Republican colleagues whom I love, and with whom I like to travel the political pathways, that there is a way out of the Republican platform which declared in favor of similar legislation, for that platform also said, and it has been our policy for years, to do away with and prevent the creation of unnecessary Government agencies and commissions; in fact, the Democrats in 1932 promised that they were going to do away with all of those agencies.

Our platform has promised both of those things, and when we promise something that will not work, that we know is wrong for the best interest of the country, the quicker we get out from under it the better. So I have an alternative, and it is this. Let us give the F. E. P. C. legislation, gentlemen. Let us give them legislation preventing discrimination in employment. Let us give it to them, and let us give it to them so that it is enforceable in the courts of the United States.

If there is in this country discrimination against anyone let us provide a remedy. Let us provide that remedy in the proven, constitutional way.

Ever since 1215 when the common people wrested the Magna Carta from King John, on down through the time when our representatives were deliberating the form the Constitution should take, and they granted to the Federal Government certain powers, but reserved unto themselves all other power not expressly granted, gave the judicial de-

partment certain powers, a certain amount of discrimination has existed. Let us throw the enforcement of this antidiscrimination legislation into the courts where it belongs.

The bill which I have written and which I offer as a substitute is this: It provides that anyone who is injured because of discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, shall have a right of action to recover all the damages which he has sustained, together with his costs, in the United States District Court in the district where he lives, to be assessed by a jury. Now what is wrong with that? What is wrong with that, gentlemen?

So I say to my Republican brethren and to the Democratic Tories, so-called—good, honest, patriotic, sincere Americans I would call them—I say, let us go along and give these F. E. P. C.ers, like my friend from Michigan, whom I always yield to—

Mr. HOOK. I thank the gentleman for the kind compliment, but I certainly am broadminded enough to recognize the fact that there has been discrimination, and because of the fact that all those we have discriminated against are bleeding and dying on the battlefields today. I hope that we recognize the fact and that we go along in the spirit of the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, now, I have written this bill to give these people a right of action. I am sure that the gentleman, who is a renowned lawyer in the northern Peninsula of Michigan, wants to abide by constitutional provisions, and I like to think that perhaps he will support, if somebody else does not see him before he votes, the bill which I will offer as a substitute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a couple of observations?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman referred to the obligations of the Republican Party and their commitments. They certainly did not commit themselves to the type of legislation which the Committee on Labor has reported out, did they?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. COLMER. The other observation is this. The gentleman referred to his love for his brethren over here on his side of the aisle.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is deep and abiding.

Mr. COLMER. He also paid a tribute to some gentlemen over on the other side of the aisle. I wanted to make this observation, if I may. This bill is being considered by the Committee on Rules. Hearings are being conducted before that committee. I wonder if the gentleman does not think that some of these folks who are rushing down here to sign a petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of that bill, before the committee has completed its hearings, had not better at least stop, look, and listen and read that bill and see what is in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When this bill was under consideration by the Committee on Labor, a very prominent and sincere Member of the House came to me and said, "Why are you fussing about that bill? It will never reach the floor of the House." I said, "Yes; it will. It will come out on petition if the Rules Committee does not send it out."

Then the other day a member of a certain committee said to me, "What are you fussing about, it will pass the House, but that does not mean anything because it will be killed in the Senate."

That is not my idea of the way to handle legislation. I would not venture to suggest what the Rules Committee should do, but I do not know why the Rules Committee does not send that bill right out on the floor with a rule providing for 3, 4, 5, or 6 days of debate. Let us have it out.

Mr. COLMER. How about 10 days of debate?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us discuss it and put the control of the time in the hands of those proposing it, the chairman of the committee and, say, the minority Members who oppose it. Let us have full and free debate.

Mr. COLMER. Would it not take about 2 weeks to debate it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, whatever it needs.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman in the remarks he made on the floor this morning negating the argument that discrimination was being practiced was giving the percentages by which minority groups had jobs. I wonder if the gentleman has covered the entire field so that in his remarks as we will read them tomorrow morning in the Record we will find that information, not only as to the colored minority but as to other minority groups in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The figures I put into the Record came from the Bureau of the Census.

In regard to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], while the figures show no discrimination, except in favor of members of minority groups, in the number of jobs, I realize that there is discrimination in that the members of the colored race hold the lower-paid jobs. So do not misunderstand me; there is no question about that.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman's remarks cover the other minority groups?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not have those figures from the Census Bureau. I could not obtain them on religion or other races.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to ask the gentleman if his distinguished friend from Michigan, whom he addressed a while ago, has any of these minority groups in his office working on his secretarial staff. If he has, then he is consistent. If he has not, then he is inconsistent, and is he then not guilty of that discrimination

which he is alleging somebody else is guilty of?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not assume to pass upon the ideas or the philosophy or the habits of any other Member of the House.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOK. It just so happens that I have only about two colored people in my whole district.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman ought to give one of them a job.

Mr. HOOK. I have those in my office who represent the constituents of my district. How many of that group has the gentleman in his office?

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman has discriminated against those two.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can understand the attitude of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], because—and he can correct me if I am wrong—as I understand it, he has been a member of or connected with the F. E. P. C. and has rendered valuable service in the activities of that agency.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a racial minority in this House that has been advocating this bill. We have found in our investigation in veterans' hospitals that they have crowded the doctors of that minority group into these hospitals all over the country and some of those hospitals have more doctors of that group than patients of that group. That situation is stirring up trouble in those hospitals. It is really causing more trouble there probably than everything else put together.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DE LACY. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Mississippi, if he is doing a little Jew baiting?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be taken down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, Mr. Speaker; I was merely stating facts with reference to conditions in our veterans' hospitals, but I am willing to withdraw those words with reference to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. De Lacy] in order that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may go ahead with his speech.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. If I have any more time, I do not yield it back.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has asked that the words of the gentleman from Mississippi be taken down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If no business has intervened.

The SPEAKER. No business can intervene for the moment unless the gentleman withdraws his objection to the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand that is the correct ruling, but I recall one time when there seemed to be some other business.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair was not occupant of the chair at the time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. We could not understand the status of the situation over here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] made some remarks. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] asked that the words be taken down. Then the gentleman from Mississippi asked unanimous consent to withdraw them and the gentleman from New York objected.

Mr. RANKIN. I did that in order to permit the gentleman from Michigan to proceed. But my statement with reference to conditions in our veterans' hospitals cannot be denied.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care anything about proceeding further.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

The SPEAKER. The Chair always regrets situations arising like this and sometimes the rulings are very difficult. But the Chair would be bound to hold, looking at the gentleman from Mississippi when he made the remarks and the gentleman from Washington, that those remarks are unparliamentary.

If no Member desires to make any motion, without objection, the words will be stricken from the Record.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### TREATY RATIFICATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain excerpts on the subject of treaty ratification.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will begin consideration of House Joint Resolution 60, a measure to submit to the State legislatures for ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution giving both Houses of Congress the right to validate treaties by majority vote.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. Is not that House Resolution 16, which the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire introduced himself?

Mr. MERROW. Report was made on House Joint Resolution 60. I introduced a resolution including the same amend-



ment some time before, but House Joint Resolution 60 is the resolution reported by the committee. The gentleman from Ohio introduced the same resolution, House Joint Resolution 72.

Mr. RAMEY. But the gentleman was the Member who first introduced the resolution.

Mr. MERROW. I introduced it first in this session of Congress on January 3. There were several introduced in the last session of Congress. I did not introduce one in the last session.

Mr. RAMEY. I remember that in the last session the gentleman was the first Member to introduce the resolution which was later known as the Fulbright resolution. I was wondering why the change of name.

Mr. MERROW. I introduced a resolution carrying the same idea which was finally adopted in the Fulbright resolution.

Mr. RAMEY. Why change the names? Is that always the situation? Does not a Member of a minority party ever receive credit for his good work? However, I realize like all unselfish Members the gentleman is thinking of the good he can do rather than the credit he receives.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will begin consideration of House Joint Resolution 60, a measure to submit to the State legislatures for ratification a proposed amendment to the Constitution giving to both Houses of Congress the right to validate treaties by a majority vote. Aside from winning the war this is the most important single question before the Nation. The Seventy-ninth Congress will not be required to pass judgment on any issue of greater significance than the amendment now under discussion to revise our constitutional peace-making machinery. If we are to build a just and lasting peace, thirty-three Members of the United States Senate must not continue to have the power to kill peace treaties.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution is as follows:

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Section I of the House Joint Resolution, which this body will begin debating tomorrow, reads thus:

Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of both Houses of Congress.

On January 3, 1945, I introduced House Joint Resolution 16 which contains the same amendment but worded differently. Section I of my resolution is as follows:

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur.

This wording, I believe, is more in keeping with the language of the Constitution. At the proper time I propose to offer this section as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 60. I hope that the House will pass this resolution by far

more than the required two-thirds vote and that the measure will be acted upon immediately by the Senate. This will give the State legislatures an opportunity to vote on the proposed amendment this year.

The twenty-first amendment to the Constitution was proposed by the Seventy-second Congress on the 20th of February 1933, and was declared in a proclamation by the Acting Secretary of State dated December 5, 1933, to have been ratified in 36 of the 48 States. Thus in less than a period of ten months the amendment became a part of the Constitution. I am thoroughly convinced that the amendment now under discussion relative to the ratification of treaties would be acted upon by the States in a much briefer period. The people of the United States are in favor of this much needed and long overdue change. I have received letters from all sections of the country voicing approval of a majority vote of both Houses of Congress in treaty making.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. In the gentleman's remarks I notice he used the phrase "people of the United States." The preamble of the Constitution begins with the words "We, the people." In fact, when one body by a two-thirds vote only can affirm a treaty, and that body represents States, have not the people been bypassed? Do you really not bypass the people when you say that the lower House of Congress shall have no voice in treaty making?

Mr. MERROW. I agree with the gentleman. I believe that the people are bypassed by the present method of treaty ratification.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio just stated that the people would be bypassed if only one-third of the Senate could under existing law prevent treaty making. If this amendment were to pass, the language of the amendment reading that only a simple majority of the Members of the Senate present would be necessary, would it not be true that only twenty-five Members of the Senate, that is, a simple majority of a quorum which would be 49 in the Senate, could make a treaty? In that case would not the difference between 96 and 25 Members of the Senate be bypassed?

Mr. MERROW. I explain that later in my remarks. The amendment under discussion provides that a majority of both Houses, not a majority of the Senate, be empowered to ratify treaties. That would necessitate the presence of a quorum of both Houses and if both Houses had the right to validate a treaty you would have at least 25 Members of the Senate voting for it and 110 Members of the House, so you would have a much better representation than you have at the present time. There is at present a veto power on treaties by one-third plus one over of the Senate.

Many organizations have adopted resolutions favoring the proposal now before us. The amendment contained in House Joint Resolution 60 could become a part of the Supreme Law of the Land in a very few months if this Congress would but need the voice of the people and submit immediately this proposition to the State legislatures.

#### THE WORLD IS SMALL

The time required to travel from continent to continent has today been unbelievably reduced by the rapid development of air travel. We live in a world which has been transformed by a great number of spectacular advancements in the physical sciences. This is an era of instant communication and swift transportation. It is utterly impossible for the United States or for any other country to live in self-sufficiency. There are no longer any remote places on the surface of this planet. The impact of modern science has made world unity necessary, if the various nations are to live in peace, one with the other. We are deeply involved and will continue to be deeply involved in the complex web of international affairs. Victories at the peace table are as essential to the future happiness and security of the world as the victories we are winning on the battle fronts. The United States is a leader in this universal war for freedom. We must continue our leadership in the post-war period, if we are to take our proper place as a responsible power in the construction of a decent international community.

James T. Shotwell in the foreword of his recent book *The Great Decision* stated:

That our victory over the Axis Powers can be made a victory over war itself, if we bring to the support of peace the same kind of realistic strategy which we devote to war. We have now to decide whether this will be done or whether as an inescapable alternative we must prepare for a possible third world war. It is a hard choice and one for which we are not ready. But there is no escape from it. Science has seen to that. This newest thing in human history has already changed the arts of peace and now is revolutionizing the technique of war. The transformation thus began is not a mere interlude in the history of mankind but, on the contrary, will go on with increasing power throughout all the future. From now on all war will be total war and therefore the preparation to meet it will also have to be total. This means that so long as the war system lasts it will not only denature the economic life of nations but will endanger all the freedoms within them. Isolation can no longer provide the safety of the past. No single nation can adequately protect itself against a force which is bound more and more to conquer nature and thus change the whole basis of national society.

A third global conflict must be prevented if we are to escape the actual scourge of fighting a war in continental United States. Our responsibility in making a permanent peace is exceedingly grave. With planes, robot bombs and hundreds of new weapons, the line of battle, in the event of future wars, will certainly be on this hemisphere. The industrial centers of this Republic will be targets for the enemy. Should we fight another world-encircling war, this

great Capital cannot hope to escape the fate that has befallen the capitals of Europe. The future security of this country demands that we create a just and lasting peace.

#### THE PEACE—A VITAL CONCERN TO ALL

This unparalleled conflict reaches into the lives of all our people. Just as this war is producing its effect upon every individual in the Nation, so will the peace be a vital, personal concern to each human being. As we move to the successful conclusion of this war, our central objective is to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace so that the generations of tomorrow will not be required to spend their substance and give their lives in another international clash of arms. The youth of America are achieving notable triumphs on every fighting front. If the leaders of this Nation and the leaders of the other powers fail in charting the way to a world free from war, then the youth of America are today making their incalculable sacrifices in vain. The United States of America is a great and growing world power. With power comes the responsibility for exercising constructive leadership. If we keep faith with those who are fighting on the battle fronts, we must formulate a lasting peace. In order to produce such a peace, adequate constitutional machinery for its construction is imperative.

Kenneth Colegrove in his book, *The American Senate and World Peace*, stated:

Action rather than inaction, as a guide to political conduct, applies to international as well as internal politics. Thus, it follows that the negative restriction upon the treaty-making power in the United States is in conflict with the moral code of this forward-looking Nation. A great State must not permit itself to be shackled in this undemocratic manner.

The victory of American armed forces in Europe, Africa, and Asia, as well as upon the high seas, may be thrown to the winds if the achievements of the battlefield are not followed up by victories of the peace table. In the matter of constitutional government we are unprepared for effective participation in the management of the United Nations. A democratic amendment of our Constitution is as much needed for winning a permanent peace as the building of armaments to defeat the Axis enemies of democracy.

#### THE CONSTITUTION

The work of making the Constitution of the United States did not begin with the Constitutional Convention of 1787 nor did it end when the framers of that immortal document finished their task. Their ancestors worked on the Constitution for centuries before 1787. Their descendants have labored ever since the Constitutional Convention adjourned. As William Bennett Munro has said:

In the wider sense of the term the makers of the American Constitution form a great and still growing company. The list will not be closed until the end of time.

Since 1787, 21 amendments to the Constitution have been adopted. In addition to these formal changes the Constitution has grown by means of statutes, judicial decisions and usages. Political systems must constantly change to meet different conditions at different times.

They must undergo modification to fit the demands of a changing environment.

The Constitution of the United States has proved itself to be highly adaptable. The fathers knew that developments would come, and therefore provided four ways to amend the original document. As time moves on, many more alterations will be necessary. The amendment we are discussing has been long overdue. If the United States of America is to assume its proper place as a world leader, then we must strike from the Constitution the antiquated treaty-ratifying procedure. One of the most-needed reforms is to adopt the amendment contained in the resolution which the House will very presently act upon.

Raymond B. Fosdick, in an article entitled "The Hour Is Late—We Must Not Fail," which appeared in the *New York Times Sunday* magazine February 11, 1945, stated:

I believe that human intelligence is capable of solving the unprecedented chaos which the world faces. And we shall solve it because we must. John Quincy Adams said of the Constitution of the United States that it had been "extorted from the grinding necessity of a reluctant nation." That is the way most advances come in human society. It was under such circumstances that the Magna Carta was born, and the Bill of Rights of 1688, and the Mayflower Compact, and the Declaration of Independence. More often than not it has been necessity—grinding necessity—which has furnished the spur for the step that had to be taken.

The grinding necessity of a world in chaos is demanding the proposed amendment.

#### A DYNAMIC FOREIGN POLICY

For the future salvation and the continued progress of our civilization, for the protection and the promotion of the self-interests of the United States, this Nation is in dire need of a positive foreign policy, a dynamic foreign policy, an enlightened foreign policy—a foreign policy based on expanding international cooperation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Having shared with the gentleman from New Hampshire for quite a long while a very intense desire to see this resolution pass and this amendment submitted to the States, I just want to here, on the eve of consideration by the House, express my personal appreciation for the fine work the gentleman has done on this resolution. We have worked together, and sometimes months passed when it seemed the way ahead was rather filled with obstacles over which we could hardly expect to climb immediately. But as we come to the consideration of this resolution I rejoice that the House will move rather soon, I believe, to correct this mistake of the Constitutional Convention. May I express my personal appreciation, as one deeply interested in the matter, for the fine contributions that have consistently been made by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate the kind words by my colleague. I wish to say to the House that the gentleman from Tennessee has been interested in this meas-

ure for a long time; in fact, he introduced a resolution during the last session of Congress containing this proposed amendment. He has worked consistently for it, and I am glad that we are soon going to have an opportunity to vote on this vital matter here in the House of Representatives.

Developments within the last half century have made a foreign policy based on expanding international cooperation imperative. This is the basic premise of the thinking being done on the various plans to produce a warless world. Such a policy must be formulated if we are to realize the objective expressed in the congressional resolutions on post-war policy by the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Foreign policy can only be effected through the mechanism of international agreements and treaties. The nature of the agreements and treaties to be decided upon during the next 15 to 20 years will determine whether or not a dynamic foreign policy of expanding international cooperation will be successful in averting future wars. Treaties and agreements are the only means whereby such a policy can be translated into cooperative action in a world of sovereign states. Not only will it be necessary to secure the ratification of treaties written at the cessation of hostilities but for several years many international undertakings supplementing the original treaties will have to be acted upon by this and other governments.

#### CLEAR AND WORKABLE CONSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURE

A clear and workable constitutional procedure for the legislative approval of treaties is a prerequisite to the adoption of proposals necessary to establish the peace. Many agencies, organizations, and government officials are talking about the shaping of an adequate post-war foreign policy. Last summer we had the Bretton Woods Conference and the Dumbarton Oaks deliberations. Recently Senator VANDENBERG made most valuable suggestions on the Senate floor which have received high acclaim throughout the country. The San Francisco Conference of the United Nations is now writing a charter for an international security organization. The conference on the west coast is the greatest in history. We all ardently hope and fervently pray that from the discussions in San Francisco will come the beginning of a plan which will prevent future international catastrophes.

As the years come and go there will be more discussion and planing in every liberty-loving country on earth as to how we can make secure the peace of the future and develop the means by which aggression may be checked and wars eliminated. The work of mankind for generations will be to achieve a just and lasting peace.

It is essential that the attention of the world be focused on peace plans. Such thinking is most necessary and commendable, but in our own country far too little attention has been devoted to the constitutional mechanism by which the plans for a permanent peace will be adopted and made to operate. There has been little thought given to



the relationship between good executive foreign policy and a workable procedure for its authorization or approval by the legislature; and conversely the relationship between bad or inadequate foreign policy on the part of the Chief Executive and unworkable or inadequate procedure for legislative review. One of the main factors in determining the kind of a foreign policy this country is to be guided by is whether or not the policy can receive a fair consideration on its merits by the elected representatives of the people. The substance of our foreign policy is determined largely by the procedure available for its democratic review by the legislators.

James B. Reston, on February 17, 1945, in commenting on the decisions coming out of Yalta, used the following pertinent paragraphs:

Thus the Yalta communique marks for the United States not the culmination of a specific foreign policy so much as the beginning of a decisive phase in the formation of an American foreign policy; it does not give the American answer to all the problems discussed at Yalta, but raises at least two momentous questions the answers to which lie on Capitol Hill:

1. Do the people of the United States, and particularly their representatives in the United States Senate, have, as the official communique states, "an inflexible purpose . . . to insure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world"; or, translated into domestic political terms: "Is the Senate ready to ratify a treaty with our major allies to use American force to keep the Germans from making war?"

2. Are the American people and the Senate "resolved upon the earliest possible establishment . . . of a general international organization to maintain peace and security"; or, again to translate the communique into political terms: "Are they ready now to authorize the President to use, on his own judgment, a certain limited amount of American forces and facilities, along with the other United Nations, in an international organization to maintain peace and security in the future?"

#### CHIEF EXECUTIVE HANDICAPPED

The Chief Executive of the United States is often inhibited in making specific proposals because of the ever-present fear that the proposals cannot secure a fair consideration on their merits in the Congress. Experience during the last quarter of a century shows clearly that the Executive hesitates to conclude strong international commitments. Our present constitutional procedure provides no clear-cut means for approval or disapproval by the people's representatives.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think it is a healthy condition for the Executive to hesitate to enter into agreements, and treaties particularly, because they are a serious thing? The breach of a treaty is many times, and almost always, the cause of war.

Mr. MERROW. I do not agree with the gentleman on the power of the Executive. I think the Chief Executive of the United States is very often the weakest representative at the conference table because he knows and the people at the table representing the other coun-

tries know that he must come back and get approval by a two-thirds vote of the Senate for any treaty that he agrees to. I would make his hands much stronger in international conferences.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. Further on that point, may I observe that the result has been that the Chief Executive simply makes executive agreements and thereby circumvents the Congress. In 1944 we entered into 74 executive agreements and no treaties. The two-thirds rule we now have in the Constitution just ties the hand of Congress and precludes our participation in foreign affairs. We just do not make treaties about which there is any controversy whatsoever. If the gentleman will read the record, he will find, I think, that that is literally true, that the big matters are handled through joint resolutions or through executive agreements and not through treaties.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Where does the Chief Executive get the authority for the executive agreements, if they, in effect, amount to treaties?

Mr. GOSSETT. He has that under some of his constitutional powers.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The War Powers Act?

Mr. GOSSETT. No. He makes them in peacetime as well as in wartime. However, we have resorted to much more of that in recent years. Fewer treaties and more executive agreements have been made. The tendency has been for the President just to resort to any expediency rather than come to the Senate for approval of a treaty.

Further, it seems to me ironical that we send Members of the House to all these international conferences. I think it is proper we should. We have two now at San Francisco. Yet we, a coordinate branch of the Congress, the most numerous branch, have nothing in the world to say about treaties.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman on that point, but I would like the House to have to ratify a treaty by a two-thirds vote as well as the Senate by a two-thirds vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire for introducing this legislation and for his very illuminating presentation of it. He is a great student of international affairs. I was very much interested when I was a delegate at the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City, with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]. I really think that both of us did a great deal of work as observers and advisers, yet it was the Members of the Senate who felt that they had the priority in much of what went on because they would ratify any treaty reached as a result of the Conference. I stated there that I thought it would be extremely valuable if the House had a vote on the

ratification of treaties. In the first place, we are much nearer to the people than are the Members of the Senate. They come up for election every 6 years, and we come up every 2 years. Our people watch us very closely. We know their desires.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for her contribution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Following up what the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has so ably said, may I say that conditions have changed. The present provisions of the Constitution are the result of a compromise in the constitutional convention. Further, for many decades and generations United States Senators were elected by the legislatures of the States. The theory was that they were the ambassadors, in a sense, of the several sovereign States to the central government, the Federal Government.

We have amended the Constitution since those days. Now United States Senators are, I believe, elected by the people in all the States the same as we are, and in most of the States they have the direct primary system.

Also, the means of communication and of travel have changed between 1789 and for some generations succeeding then and today.

All of these are factors that enter into the great and important question the gentleman from New Hampshire is so ably discussing, and they seem to me to prompt only one conclusion, that in the best interests of our country the House should be a party to the approval of treaties, and that a majority vote of both branches, acting concurrently, should be sufficient to approve a treaty. Our actions—passage of this resolution by both branches of the Congress must be ratified by three-fourths of the States as provided for by the Constitution.

Mr. MERROW. I want to thank the majority leader for his fine words and to express my deep appreciation for the assistance he has given in this important matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I can see nothing wrong with what the distinguished majority leader said in the first part of his remarks as regards the Members of the Senate. I think there is a great difference. They were formerly elected by their respective legislatures and were supposed to be very outstanding gentlemen of great ability. But now they are elected by popular vote, and they represent the people more or less as we do, rather than the State, as they did formerly. I cannot conceive of anyone, as a Member of this Body, the House of Representatives, who would object to bringing the House into the picture. But when it comes to having simply a majority of both the House and the Senate, I would say the Congress would be less in the picture than they are today with two-thirds rule in the Senate. I would

like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire or the gentleman from Massachusetts what objection would there be to really bringing the House into the picture with the two-thirds vote required in the House as well as in the Senate?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] if he wishes to answer that question.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman's question consists of two parts, one that the House be a treaty-approving Body. We are both agreed on that.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. There are two propositions in this proposal, are there not?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am talking about the gentleman's inquiry. The gentleman agrees with me that the House should have concurrent action with the Senate in the approval of treaties. Now, that is agreed upon.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Now the question arises whether it should be by majority vote or two-thirds vote. I recognize the fact that the people may honestly disagree on that question. I have profound respect for anyone whose views differ from mine on that issue.

Then there is going to be a ratification of the resolution by three-quarters of the legislatures of the several States of the Union, either by the legislature, or if they have the power in the State to submit it to the people on the question of a final vote. I believe when you link those two together, the majority vote of both branches is more consistent with the democratic rule of procedure. The democratic rule of procedure is that the majority prevails.

With reference to the question of an honest difference of opinion on the majority vote or two-thirds vote, in my opinion a majority vote with both branches acting concurrently seems to be more consistent with democratic practices and it certainly would be adequate protection in the ratification of treaties. Furthermore, may I make this observation, that when the representatives of our country are sitting at a table with the representatives of other countries in the consideration of a treaty, such as the peace treaty, for example, they have in mind the fact that when as diplomats they complete their consideration of it, their action is final. That is probably the case with most other nations. But in the case of the United States, the action is not final. The action then has to go into the political field, so far as our activities in America are concerned. Certainly it would be more consistent with a foreign policy beneficial to our country to have ratification by a majority of both branches of Congress than to have two-thirds vote of one branch, because the only benefit of bringing the House in with a two-thirds vote would be that instead of correcting the difficulty in the Senate it would make it more difficult.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The gentleman says it would be more democratic to require of the House and Senate a simple majority vote on this ques-

tion. Does not the gentleman agree that the Executive would have more power in treaty making were we to pass this amendment than he has today?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No; I would not think so.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Did not the gentleman just say that when the Executive met with foreign countries and sat around the peace table he was in a disadvantageous position?

Mr. MCCORMACK. What I did say was that the representatives of other countries are aware of the fact that when a treaty has been concluded, as far as the diplomats are concerned, it is final with most of their countries, but with our country it is not final. It is then transferred from the diplomatic field into the political arena and it requires a two-thirds vote.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. When the gentleman speaks of the political arena—

Mr. MCCORMACK. I say that descriptively.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. We are the only great nation that requires a two-thirds vote on the ratification of a treaty by a legislative body, but also we are the only great power that has a two-party system, and it seem to me that the Executive of this country, who is not only the legal head of our country but also the head of the majority party and usually has perhaps 55 percent of the members of his party in power in the Congress, when it comes back to the political arena it would be very easy for the Executive to get approval if we only had to have a simple majority. It seems to me that the President would have far more power than under the existing arrangement.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was very much impressed at the conference at Mexico City with the fact that the delegates apparently gave just as much consideration to the views of the Members of the House, who do not ratify treaties, as they did to Senators. That was a very great courtesy. Apart from their courtesy, I felt it indicated that they realized the importance of having the Representatives, who are closest to the people, approve of what was being done. I think it was very significant. That is the first time that Representatives from the Congress have sat in at these conferences. I also felt that the fact we were asked, showed that the State Department wishes our approval, and was a step toward giving us the power of ratification of treaties.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Those who were at the Mexico City Conference certainly did a remarkable piece of work. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, as she was one of them. I want to observe in relation to the gentleman's last statement, I think the remarks of the gentleman from New Hampshire are a marked contribution, and the questions asked are for the purpose of bringing out the salient points

in this resolution which will come up for consideration tomorrow. I am very pleased that I happened to be on the floor and listened in part to the remarks of the gentleman from New Hampshire and the questions asked. It is most refreshing to me to see the high plane on which this debate is proceeding.

Practically there is something to what the gentleman says, but that is from a practical angle, and I do not think it should be applied to the principle involved. It is fortunate that we do have the two-party system in America. Let us hope it is continued, because then the people are able to place responsibility on the party they put in power, whether it is the gentleman's party or my party. We hope that will continue. But with all due respect to my friend, that does not address itself to me as a very potent piece of evidence as to why the change should not be made.

It does seem to me in these modern times that for the best interest of the country the House should have a voice in the ratification of treaties. To require a two-thirds vote in the House, the same as in the Senate, instead of meeting the problem in these days that confront us with reference to the ratification of treaties makes it more difficult, because not only do we leave unchanged the two-thirds requirement in the Senate, but we impose upon that concurrent action in the House again by a two-thirds vote; and we are only making it more difficult of accomplishment.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Permit me to make a brief observation: In the early history of our Republic, in fact, for almost the first 75 years, there was considerable agitation in the House of Representatives to have the treaty power shared jointly between the two bodies. I am afraid that is often lost sight of. Many of the founding fathers of the republic after the compromise to which the gentleman from Massachusetts, our distinguished majority leader, referred, still kept up agitation and tried to get the treaty making power back into the House of Representatives. That agitation died out only shortly after the Civil War. No more was heard of the matter until recently; but this is not by any stretch of the imagination a brand new concept that is being thrust at the American people.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think it is excellent that the House of Representatives is taking the leadership in trying to bring about this needed reform at this time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to observe that under the present system, in which a minority of the Senate can block the ratification of any treaty, the cards are actually stacked against ratification. That, it seems to me, would be entirely appropriate if there were a presumption that the executive branch of the Government, in negotiating treaties, were wrong, but I do not see why there should be any such presumption. It



seems to me there ought to be the presumption that the executive branch of the Government and duly accredited representatives of the United States, in negotiating a treaty, have acted patriotically and wisely. There should not be the contrary presumption, and I am unable to understand any real ground for continuing the contrary presumption.

While I am on my feet, I wish also to say that I, too, feel very strongly that the gentleman's aggressive work in behalf of this cause, his leadership, has been very fine, and I want to pay him a very sincere tribute for it.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Maine. As far as I personally am concerned, I believe our Chief Executive, the President of the United States, no matter to which party he might belong, should be much stronger in international affairs than he is at the present time. In my opinion, the present method of treaty ratification shackles him to a great extent. It would be to the benefit of the entire country and to the world if his hands were made much stronger than they are now.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I also wish to compliment the gentleman from New Hampshire for his work. With his permission I wish to make a brief statement. Ours is supposed to be a government of checks and balances. When we consider the average run of congressional enactments that require a simple majority vote of both Houses to pass, yet the President if he sees fit may veto them and then it takes a two-thirds vote of both branches of Congress to override his veto, it is just as important in my opinion, treaties being sacred contracts between this and other nations, just as important if not more important that the Congress on its part should have the right of veto. Certainly with the President having the right to initiate treaties, as he does under our Constitution, the Congress should be brought prominently into the picture. Certainly we should have a veto power, and I cannot see that a simple majority would amount to much in the way of a veto.

Mr. MERROW. A simple majority vote would not leave the exercise of the veto power over treaties in the hands of a small minority of the Senate as it is now. When you speak about the two-thirds vote necessary to override the President's veto, I do not think that is analogous to the question under discussion and has no bearing on it.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Certainly the gentleman will agree that if we are to have a simple majority requirement in both Houses it would lessen the power of Congress, would it not?

Mr. MERROW. It would increase the power of Congress.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Why does the gentleman say that when the President sits at the peace table under existing law he would be at a disadvantage?

Mr. MERROW. Because 33 Members of the United States Senate can vitiate anything he does. It should also be pointed out that by adding reservations

and amendments in the Senate, which are adopted by a majority vote, any treaty can be so loaded with reservations and amendments that you could not get ratification by two-thirds of the Senate. The President is weak because he has to secure two-thirds of that body to ratify any peace treaty to which he agrees. If he brings back a peace proposal and if he can have it ratified by a majority of both Houses of the Congress, his position is strengthened.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I am thinking of protecting the minority in this country. If we were to pass a simple enactment today and in 2 years from now sentiment should shift slightly, a couple percent, say, then what may have been 51 percent 2 years ago changes to 49 percent. We can do away with that very easily, can we not? That is a law of course that would only affect the people within this country. Treaties on an average last a longer length of time and other nations are involved. It would not be so easy to rescind our action in the case of a treaty because another nation or other nations are involved.

Mr. MERROW. If a majority of the Congress cannot protect us, nothing can protect us.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Just what does the gentleman's resolution provide?

Mr. MERROW. The resolution provides for treaty ratification by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. BREHM. It provides that we submit the matter to the States?

Mr. MERROW. We are going to make the decision right here. It will be submitted to the Congress and if a majority of the Senate and House approve, then the treaty is validated. Of course a quorum of both Houses must be present.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman did not get my question. Are we not saying to the States that we are giving it to the people and they have the right to vote on this?

Mr. MERROW. Yes. When we vote favorably on this resolution we are giving the State legislature an opportunity to act and the people of the country an opportunity to act through their State legislatures.

Mr. BREHM. After all, that is the democratic process, and I am in favor of it.

Mr. MERROW. It would seem to me that is the duty of the Congress. I believe the people want an opportunity to act. I will say so far as the Legislature of New Hampshire is concerned that it will be the first legislature to approve the proposed amendment.

Mr. BREHM. I am not suggesting how I will vote on this resolution, but I am willing at all times to submit the matter to the people of the United States to make their decision on this question.

Mr. MERROW. That is the thing to do. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

The wisest and boldest executive foreign policy cannot be effective unless it has the sustained support of the Congress and the people. The only way to

ascertain whether or not a particular measure has that support is to submit it to the national legislature for approval or disapproval. Under our form of government, such submission can only be satisfactorily accomplished by affording the Congress an opportunity to consider and debate specific matters contained in agreements and treaties. A dynamic foreign policy of expanding international cooperation backed by an informed and sustained public opinion presupposes that it will be necessary to submit many more international matters to Congress than has been the case at any previous time in our history.

We are in world affairs, and in the years to come there will be a multitude of matters which will have to be submitted to the national legislature for final decision.

One does not need to have more than a good passing acquaintance with the present tangle of historical, legal, and political considerations involved, not to mention controversy on the merits of a matter, to realize that unless the procedural outlook is decidedly clearer in the future, there is little basis for hoping that any administration will dare follow this course, particularly in the hard years to come, when the emotional carrying power of the war and peace issues will have been dissipated by a return to normalcy and the luxury of uninhibited party politics.

Without adequate treaty procedure the undertakings and proposals of the United States will not be accepted at face value in international conferences. Other countries have good reasons to be skeptical of the ability of the United States to carry out over a sustained period a foreign policy of cooperation adequate to meet the needs of the modern scientific world. The Nation is left nearly helpless to assist in establishing permanent peace under present procedure. The President cannot speak for the people, since whatever he does is subject to a veto by one-third of the Senate. Other nations have grounds to doubt seriously the capacity of the United States to play an active role in organizing the world community after the war is won. Leaders in other countries are reluctant to enter into agreements with this country since they know that a minority in the Senate can doom any peace treaty approved by the President of the United States. Statesmen the world over will be increasingly unwilling to enter into undertakings with us which stand little chance of being considered on their merits. Our negotiators go to international conferences handicapped. The hands of the American diplomats would be strengthened if treaties could be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses.

Stuart H. Perry, scholar and newspaperman, stated in an address before the National Newspaper Publishers' Association several years ago, and which appears in the committee hearings:

The result is that no administration can feel even reasonably sure of its ground in negotiating an important treaty unless it can rely upon a strong party majority in the Senate. That majority, to be effective, must

be much larger than an executive would require in any other country having a parliamentary form of government. Where, as in other countries, a majority vote in parliament is sufficient for all purposes, a safe "working majority" is all that the executive needs; here he must be able to count upon sufficient party strength in the Senate to insure a majority of 2 to 1 upon a treaty question. He can, it is true, count upon converting a few members of the opposition upon the merits of the case, but experience has proved that the number of such converts is small, and furthermore they are likely to be offset by a certain number of defections from the administration ranks. Therefore, in order to insure the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution for the ratification of treaties, his party strength in the Senate must be measured by approximately the same ratio.

William Bennett Munro, in his book *The Makers of the Unwritten Constitution*, wrote:

Fundamentally, the control of American foreign relations is vested in one-third of the membership in one-half of Congress. Definite, forceful, responsible leadership is in no branch of government more essential than in the field of diplomacy and foreign affairs. All other countries have it, and how we get along without it in the United States is something that the rest of the world has given up trying to understand. John Hay once predicted that no important treaty would ever again pass the Senate without mutilation, thus disclosing an exaggerated pessimism; yet it has become transparently obvious that every treaty goes into the Senate with the chances 2 to 1 against it, no matter what its merits, and that in many cases the likelihood of its being carried out in an ambulance justifies a wager of even three or four to one. Strength, promptness, and decision in the exercise of the treaty-making power are thus replaced by weakness, equivocation, and delay.

Without a clear-cut and workable procedure for legislative approval or disapproval of agreements and treaties, our thinking on matters of foreign policy is impaired because of the heavy political liabilities in the legislative approval process. We cannot build up a solid congressional and public understanding and backing for a cooperative policy because of inability to submit more foreign policy matters for a complete congressional review. Other parties hesitate to offer full value in cooperative undertakings on our part since they carry with them exceedingly heavy political uncertainties in the process of legislative examination and action.

Our procedure is neither clear nor workable. There is no distinct line of demarcation between agreements and treaties. It is not workable because one-third of the Senate has complete control of the foreign policy of this country in the matter of making peace. As long as we continue to use inadequate constitutional machinery we will experience insurmountable difficulties in creating a foreign policy of expanding international cooperation. We may devise many plans for world peace but under the present system they must be accepted by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. We need to develop a constitutional mechanism for fair approval or disapproval of international agreements and treaties. With proper constitutional procedure we will be able to act intelligently and democratically upon peace plans soon to be

presented. A surgeon cannot perform a delicate brain operation with dull instruments. We cannot win the peace with an inadequate and inferior constitutional method for treaty ratification.

#### TWO FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

In the discussion of this subject we find there are two fundamental questions involved. First, should treaties be acted upon in the Congress by a majority or by a two-thirds vote and, second, should the House participate in the ratification of treaties. In the consideration of these issues it will be most helpful to review briefly the history of the two-thirds rule.

#### HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The United States is the only great nation requiring a two-thirds vote of one branch of the legislative body to ratify treaties. I quote a statement made by Melvin D. Hildreth, general counsel of the late President Roosevelt's War Relief Board, a member of the commission to study the organization of peace, and a member of the National Board of Directors of the League of Nations, before the Committee on the Judiciary:

A survey of the constitutional systems of the world does not reveal a counterpart of our plan of associating only one House of the legislature with the Executive in treaty making.

Denna Frank Fleming included in his book, *The United States and the World Court* the following words:

Never in all human history has any other important people ever subjected itself to an arrangement so plainly and inherently unworkable. After 1789 dozens of new governments were set up. All of their founders examined our Constitution with care and many of them modeled strongly after us, but only Liberia and Guatemala ever copied the two-thirds Senate vote for treaties. Again after the World War many new constitutions were made, but not one of them ever thought it a reasonable thing to give one-third of one house of the national legislature a strangle hold on treaties. Yet we remain in our most crucial affairs at the mercy of one-sixteenth of our legislators.

There is absolutely no political theory on which the two-thirds rule is based.

Dr. Charles Warren, historian of the Supreme Court and author, in discussing the subject, wrote:

That clause, as I say, is a striking illustration of the class of provisions which was inserted not on any theory of government or general political theory but was inserted solely to take care of a political condition existing, and a very burning question existed in 1787 when the Federal Convention sat. The circumstances surrounding its insertion provide an interesting illustration of the fact that, like most of the provisions of the Constitution, it can only be fully understood after a study of its historical sources and antecedents.

The reasons motivating the writers of the Constitution to insert the requirement have long since disappeared. The Articles of Confederation providing for treaty ratification by a vote of 9 out of 13 States were in the immediate background as the makers of the Constitution did their work. The continuity between the Constitution and the Articles of Confederation, which is to be found at so many points, is also present in certain

fundamental aspects of the treaty provision. Under the Articles of Confederation, the treaty power was exercised by a Congress in which the States were not only represented as States but voted as States as well. The power to make treaties was regarded as one of the fundamental attributes of State sovereignty. The treaty power was viewed as a right and concern of the States, not of the people. This is perhaps the most fundamental and currently pertinent point in the entire historical aspect of the question. It is important because it is contrary to the assumption which most people make in connection with the two-thirds provision. That rule is usually thought of and justified in terms of requiring an extraordinary majority in order to assure a large measure of popular unanimity when in fact it was never so intended and does not necessarily so operate.

Demand for the two-thirds rule came from the jealousies and suspicions of the original States. The South was interested in navigation on the Mississippi River. The New England States were concerned in protecting fishery rights. Sections were fearful lest treaties might be made which would interfere with their respective economic interests.

The Constitution was to become effective when ratified by 9 States. At the time of the Constitutional Convention there was serious doubt that even this number would join the Union. If but 9 had adopted the Constitution then the Senate would have consisted of only 18 Members. In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 no one ever dreamed that the Senate would become a body of 96. In the beginning the House itself was to consist of only 65 Members. The fathers intended that the President should consult and advise with the Senate.

It was believed that secrecy would prevail in the small Senate and that treaties would be made in executive sessions. All of the conditions I have mentioned—prominence of State sovereignty, secrecy and conflicting economic interests no longer exist. With the growth of the country they have long since passed off the stage, and today the United States of America stands alone as the only great Nation to employ the cumbersome, obstructive, and senseless two-thirds requirement.

#### THE RECORD OF THE SENATE

The record of the Senate in the disposition of treaties for the settlement of international disputes is most disheartening. In writing this record the Senate has ably demonstrated its inability to act constructively in international affairs. Peace treaties and treaties of arbitration have suffered irreparable mutilation at the hands of the Senate. Since the Spanish-American War the United States has been a growing world power. Again and again during the last 50 years the Senate has frustrated moves to substitute the peaceful settlement of international disputes for war. The Onley-Pauncefote arbitration treaty of 1897 was rejected. The Hay arbitration treaties of 1904 were emasculated. The Senate maintained a strangle hold on the Root arbitration treaties of 1908 and 1910.



The life was taken out of the Taft arbitration treaties of 1911. The Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations were destroyed by the two-thirds rule of the Senate. On January 29, 1935, the World Court was rejected by a vote of 52 for to 36 against. In recent years few treaties of any great consequence have been ratified. One is forced to the conclusion that no treaty of far-reaching importance in connection with the establishment of peace can be validated under the two-thirds rule.

In connection with the Senate's record Denna Frank Fleming in his recent book, *The United States and the World Court*, used the following language:

The Senate has had its day as the executioner of our peace treaties. It has been a long day and its fruits have been inexpressibly bitter. This judgment does not mean that our full participation in the attempts of the last 4 decades to build substitutes for war would have made everything different, or even that this war would have been avoided. It does mean that the Senate would not even permit us to try to provide substitutes for war or to make the objectives of the last war stick, in order to save our future from a more horrible fate than the terrible, pitiable catastrophe of 1914-18. This is the offense of the Senate, an offense so calamitous in its effects that we dare not permit it to be repeated. As the censor of our foreign policy the Senate has been fully tried and found wanting. Its frustration of our share in creating and governing an orderly world must be ended. The alternative is a third world war which would cost us half a trillion dollars, exhaust finally the bulk of our mineral resources, and devastate our urban civilization, from one end of this continent to the other. No nation can afford to permit a defect in its government to bankrupt and destroy it.

Dr. Frank M. Russell of the University of California has written as follows:

It has been pointed out by defenders of this provision of the Constitution that over the whole course of our history the Senate has actually rejected few treaties, and the number that it has amended has not been considerable. That is true, but the whole story cannot be told in terms of mathematics. In recent decades, certainly, the most important treaties from the point of view of building an economically and politically integrated and peaceful world—the only kind of world in which our safety and prosperity can be promoted—are the ones that have suffered emasculation or mutilation, if not actual rejection at the hands of a minority of isolationists in the Senate. The result has been that our Presidents have at times been deterred even from negotiating treaties regarded as desirable from the point of view of the public interest, and for which they would be able to secure a majority vote in both Houses of Congress, because of their realization of the hopelessness of overcoming the opposition of a stiff-necked minority in the Senate.

#### MAJORITY RULE

A fundamental principle of democracy is majority rule. The present method of treaty ratification is undemocratic in the extreme. The population of Nevada is 110,247; of New York, 13,479,142. Since the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, Senators are elected directly by the people. In rejecting treaties, the vote of a Senator from Nevada is worth twice that of a Senator from New York who votes approval. The power of a voter in the State of Nevada in this connection is the same as that of 120 voters in the

Empire State. Pennsylvania has a population of 9,900,180. The 2 votes from Nevada could cancel the votes of the Senators from Pennsylvania and New York. Thus, the Senators representing 110,247 can override the will of Senators representing 23,379,322. This is a most undemocratic process. There are no logical arguments to sustain the position that the vote of a legislator who objects to a treaty is worth twice as much as one who favors it.

One-third plus one of the membership of the smaller House of Congress has in its hands life-and-death power over any and all treaties. Under existing procedure, if the entire Senate membership of 96 were present, Senators from 17 States voting against a treaty could cause its defeat. Were the Members opposed to a treaty to come from 17 of the smallest States, rejection would result by the action of Senators representing States with a population of approximately ten and one-half million people, according to the census figures of 1940. If the remaining Senators, representing States with a population of 120,000,000 people, should all vote for the treaty, then their will could be overruled by the Members who represent 10,500,000. Should only a quorum of the Senate be in attendance when a vote on a treaty is taken, 17 Members could prevent ratification. If the 17 votes should come from the smallest States and the 32 votes from the 16 largest States, the Senators from States with approximately 3,500,000 could thwart the will of Senators from States with a population of over 88,000,000.

These are, I realize, extreme cases and the alinement to which I have referred may never occur. The situations pictured are, however, possibilities under our system and speak eloquently for the undemocratic character of our constitutional procedure of treaty ratification. By including the House we would require in the most extreme instance, at least, 110 Members of this body plus 25 Senators to reject a treaty. This would be the situation in the event only a bare quorum existed at the time of voting. Majority approval by both Houses would be infinitely better than the two-thirds rule we now follow. I quote a statement made by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler on this subject:

There is one important change which the people of the United States must make in their Constitution without delay. The provision that a treaty with another government requires ratification by a vote of two-thirds of the United States Senate is not only harmful and undemocratic but anti-democratic as well. Treaties should be ratified as statutes are enacted, by a majority vote in each of the two Houses of Congress. The present system, if not changed, might easily lead to almost irreparable damage to the prosperity and happiness of the American people as well as to the great movement of international cooperation to establish and maintain world peace. The present constitutional provision makes it possible for a very small number of Senators, one-third of a quorum plus one, representing perhaps only 10,000,000 of the country's vast population, to prevent the ratification of a treaty of highest importance for national prosperity and international cooperation and peace. Were this done by a majority vote in each of the two Houses of Congress, the

people themselves would be responsible. The present plan of action, however, completely separates the responsibility of the American people from ratification or rejection of a treaty. There is no more important question than this before the country at the present moment. To effect this vitally important change, the pending amendment to the Federal Constitution should be adopted by the people without delay. Otherwise no one can foretell what damage may be done to the public welfare, both national and international.

Opponents to the proposed amendment call attention to the unanimous consent required by juries; to the two-thirds provision for the impeachment of a President; to the two-thirds vote necessary to override a President's veto; and say that more than a majority should be necessary in certain decisions of vast importance. They then conclude that in the matter of making treaties we should retain the two-thirds requirement. These cases are not analogous to the two-thirds provision for treaty ratification and have no bearing on the question at hand.

William Y. Elliott, former chairman of the School of Government, Harvard University, appearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, said:

As you know, sir, a veto by the President of an act passed by Congress indicates, after all, a division of opinion between the Executive and the Congress on a legislative matter on which both, by the Constitution, are entitled to have a view, the President by his veto. The practice, of course, under the party system, is that the President is a leader in the formulation of policy.

Treaty-making power, on the other hand, is something in which the President, the only officer elected—along with the Vice President—by a national vote of all the people, is asking agreement of another body of the Government. He is asking for it in terms of supporting something he is doing. He is not vetoing something the other body has done; he is asking for support of what he is doing. Therefore, the minority provision that is holding up ratification of a treaty is in effect the veto power by a very slight minority of the Government.

It is not an affirmation and repassing of something over a veto. Let us get that distinct. What happens is that a veto stops an act passed by an ordinary majority of Congress. There is, therefore, a difference of opinion between the two. Now, in order to get that repassed over the veto, the President has to get it repassed by a two-thirds majority of the Senate and of the House, because there has been a difference of opinion between the two parties.

The Senate, on the other hand, can block the President from acting in this matter by a simple one-third power of the most unrepresentative body in the world from the point of population. That is an extraordinary situation.

A majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to enact Federal statutes. A majority is deemed ample to commit the Republic to such a program as lend-lease and other policies of great national and international moment. A simple majority of Congress is sufficient to take us into war. Surely the formulation of the peace is as grave a matter as making war, yet it is easier for this Government to declare war than to write a peace. There is no conceivable reason why a majority of both Houses is not enough to validate peace treaties. Under the present system a treaty of far-reaching importance, a treaty embodying principles

on which the structure of world peace might be erected could be rejected by a militant minority of the Senate even if a majority of the Senate wished to ratify it; even if a majority of the House of Representatives desired its acceptance, yes, even if a majority of the American people demanded its validation. The treaty section of the Constitution is a serious handicap to our leadership in international cooperation. To continue the two-thirds rule for ratification by the Senate is to impair, if not to imperil, our successful participation in the conduct of foreign affairs.

The argument that majority control of treaty making would result in hasty, ill-considered, unwise, and discriminatory action against certain sections of the country is the weakest of all arguments coming from those who hold that this power should be vested in one-third of the Senate. If a majority of the Congress cannot protect our interests then nothing can save us. The burden of proof rests on those who contend that less than a majority of one House of the National Legislature should direct the foreign relations of this great Nation in the post-war period.

As Kenneth Colegrove has so ably stated in his book, *The American Senate and World Peace*:

One by one the oligarchic features of our Constitution have been replaced by democratic institutions. The progress in democracy has been accomplished by amendments to the Constitution, judicial interpretation, and custom and usage. The ratification of treaties, however, is one of the remaining aspects of our Constitution which belong to the eighteenth rather than the twentieth century. It is nothing less than a perpetuation of minority rule and a negation of the democratic process.

#### EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND TREATIES

In the relationships between executive agreements, joint resolution, and treaties there is much confusion. It is obvious that all international undertakings cannot be concluded constitutionally as pure executive agreements or as agreements approved by joint resolutions of Congress. From a purely legal point of view, it is not clear that the joint resolution procedure, to say nothing of the executive agreement, may be substituted for treaty procedure. There is no clear dividing line either in the Constitution or in constitutional usage between what can be done by agreement procedure or what must be or should be done by treaty. The Supreme Court has never attempted to draw the line. Experts have not been able to do it and there is in the Congress sharp disagreement and widespread confusion on the question.

As long as the two-thirds rule remains a part of the Constitution, any important international undertaking which is not submitted to the Senate as a treaty is certain to be opposed in that body not only on its merits and on a partisan basis but also on the ground that the constitutional prerogatives of the Senate are being circumvented. If, for example, the Charter of the United Nations, when finally written, should be submitted as an agreement in a joint resolution, the Senate would, without doubt, insist that

it ought to be incorporated in a treaty and would not act on it as an agreement.

The two-thirds rule was incorporated in the Connally resolution. Paragraph 5 of which reads as follows:

That pursuant to the Constitution of the United States any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-third of the Senators present concur.

From this section of the Connally resolution and especially from the record of the Senate debate thereon those who have entertained any thought of bypassing the two-thirds rule by having the peace settlement and the immediate establishment of future international organizations acted upon by the joint resolution process are mistaken. The practical choice now is either to support those in and out of Congress who propose that the problem be met straightforwardly by a constitutional amendment or to make our foreign policy fit the political hazards of action under the two-thirds procedure. A foreign policy so designed must at best be weak and ineffective.

The pure executive agreement which is made without either congressional authorization or approval is limited in its usefulness both in the routine conduct of foreign affairs and in the formulation of foreign policy. It cannot be employed in situations requiring a general change in our domestic law in connection with international agreements. Such agreements are not suitable for handling foreign-policy undertakings where it is desirable and necessary to obtain democratic review and approval of proposed policies.

The joint resolution authorized and approved by the majority of both Houses is subject to certain uncertainties and limitations aside from the political liability inherent in its general use as long as the two-thirds rule stands. The joint resolution is an important procedure and is the product of constitutional usage. It has served three important purposes: first, as a political mechanism for avoiding the barriers of the two-thirds rule in some important instances such as the annexation of Texas in 1845 and Hawaii in 1898; second, it is a workable mechanism for prior authorization of definite international agreements in technical fields such as tariffs and postal regulations. It is often more practical politically and technically to conclude agreements on the basis of prior authorization than to negotiate an agreement which must be brought back to the Congress for approval. The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is a classic example of this procedure. In the third place the joint resolution has furnished proof of the feasibility and the desirability of having treaties subject to the full democratic review of both Houses. The joint resolution procedure has really pointed the way and shown the necessity for changing the present constitutional process for security legislative approval of treaties. The joint resolution pro-

cedure is not and cannot be a generally recognized and acceptable means for submitting important international undertakings for congressional review and approval.

The foreign relations of the United States are becoming ever more complex.

Agreements and joint resolutions have been and will be resorted to in an effort to circumvent the two-thirds rule. Many matters which would have been considered by the founding fathers as treaties have been handled as agreements and resolutions. As a result of this practice congressional influence in foreign affairs is bound to constantly diminish. At any time the Senate may reject an agreement contained in a resolution if it considers the matter of treaty importance. The adoption of the proposed amendment will receive the effectiveness of the voice of the representatives of the people in international affairs. For self-preservation and for augmenting its own influence in foreign relations the Senate itself should be the first to accede enthusiastically to the growing demand for this constitutional reform. Here we have the tragic spectacle of a great and powerful branch of the Congress unable to function according to the wishes of the majority of that body, because of the stultifying two-thirds rule.

#### THE HOUSE SHOULD HAVE A VOICE IN TREATY MAKING

The House, which is in a better position to reflect public opinion than the Senate, should have a voice in treaty making. So intricate have become human affairs that domestic laws are closely interwoven with foreign policy. The statutes affecting the merchant marine, the size of the Army, the exchange of materials of war, tariffs, and appropriations to implement treaties are illustrations of subjects in which the House has a voice and are matters closely connected with foreign policy. It is impossible to draw a line between local problems and the issues connected with foreign affairs. Few treaties can be sustained without implementing legislation requiring the concurrence of both Houses of Congress. There is no valid reason why one type of legislation would be possible by only a two-thirds vote of the Senate when legislation implementing this must receive the sanction of the other House. No foreign policy agreed upon by the Senate can long endure unless it has the wholehearted support of the people. This can best be given by including the House of Representatives in the process of ratifying treaties.

Under article VI of the Constitution treaties are a part of the supreme law of the land along with the Constitution and laws enacted in pursuance thereof. This is a compelling reason for associating the House with treaty making. The majority of Congress may abrogate a treaty by voting for conflicting legislation or failing to pass subsidiary legislation. The agencies of government empowered to abrogate a treaty should be consulted in the formulation of a treaty. By including the House in treaty making undue delay by the Senate would be greatly



lessened if not entirely prevented. With the House voting, we would actually be able to establish a people's peace, since the House reflects public opinion much more accurately than the Senate.

#### PEACE PLANS

When finally formulated the charter of the United Nations for the establishment of an international organization to maintain peace and security will have to be placed before the Senate in a treaty. The course of action suggested by Senator VANDENBERG, if followed, must be presented in treaties. Any plan designed to establish a permanent peace will, under existing practices, have to be put in the form of a treaty. In my opinion abolition of the two-thirds rule will increase the likelihood of this Nation joining a world organization to preserve the peace. It may well be that two-thirds of the Senate will agree to the charter of the United Nations based on Dumbarton Oaks, or to the Vandenberg suggestions, but even this would be no argument for retaining the two-thirds rule. Many treaties and many agreements supplementing and implementing the first treaties adopted after the war ends, will have to be agreed upon. During the next 20 years legislative approval will be required on a multitude of vital proposals to maintain the peace. Those who feel that we can develop a dynamic foreign policy of expanding international cooperation under the two-thirds rule are indulging in unwarranted optimism. I, for one, am not willing to risk the future development of our foreign policy in the hands of one-third of the United States Senate.

It seems reasonably clear that the two-thirds procedure does not furnish workable, adequate, or satisfactory machinery for the participation of the Congress in the democratic formulation and maintenance of an enlightened foreign policy. The machinery has broken down so frequently and has been such a fruitful source of conflict between the Executive and the Senate that there is no reason for assuming any basic improvement in the future. If the present procedure is continued important treaties are certain to fail or be badly mangled during the critical post-war period. The consequences for us and the rest of the world will be most serious.

Under the existing two-thirds requirement it is the exception rather than the rule for any important treaty to be approved. If a treaty is sufficiently consequential to involve some controversy it is in all probability doomed to failure either by reservations or amendments or by a combination of two lines of opposition; that on the merits and that on political grounds. Few treaties can successfully carry these two opposition loads and stand any chance of securing the approval of two-thirds of the Senators present.

#### REASONS FOR CHANGING THE PROCEDURE

The proposed constitutional amendment should be immediately adopted in the light of an imposing array of cogent arguments. First, the present method is archaic and unsuited for this great Nation in the modern world revolutionized by science. Second, under the two-

thirds rule it will be impossible to develop a dynamic foreign policy of expanding international cooperation adequate to establish and to guarantee the continuation of a just and lasting peace. Third, the present method for legislative review and approval is neither clear nor workable. Fourth, the reasons for including the two-thirds rule no longer exist. This is the only great power to have such a stumbling block in the effective execution of its foreign policy. Fifth, the two-thirds rule is undemocratic in the extreme. Sixth, the House of Representatives, much closer to the people than the Senate because it is elected every 2 years, should have a voice in treaty making.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman mentioned that the House of Representatives is closer to the people and that brings me back to the words of the preamble of the Constitution: "We, the people."

After all, in spite of the fact that Senators are now elected by popular vote, Senators represent the State, and the Members of Congress represent "We, the people," do we not?

If I may go a little further, there are, as I understand, 3,000,000 civilians on the pay roll of the United States of America. Five hundred and thirty-three of them are elected by the people—the President, the Vice President, 96 Senators, and the Members of the House of Representatives. There are only 435 persons out of that whole group which are doing governmental work who can be "fired" by the people every 2 years. When you take that group of people from the people, the only group which has no social security, the group which is not looking for a career or for something monetary, the group which is here simply to give of themselves for the people, the group which is in a goldfish bowl—God knows, if you cannot share the decisions with that group, then you are not sharing the decisions with those close to and from the people themselves.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RAMEY. And you are not really bypassing "We, the people" in the words of the preamble of the Constitution if you say the Representatives who are elected by the people and who can be fired every 2 years shall have no part in the making of treaties?

Mr. MERROW. The House of Representatives is certainly the branch of the Congress which is closest to the people and which is being bypassed and has no voice in the all-important matter of treaty making.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I was very much interested in the remarks by the gentleman from Ohio. The thought occurs to me, considering that all of the power involved in treaty making comprises 100 percent of that power, if the power of the Executive is enhanced, the power which the Executive gets must come from the Congress, must it not? That is the only place it can come from,

Mr. MERROW. It comes from the people.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Well, we consider the Congress as representatives of the people. We are the people, in effect. Therefore, it seems to me if we leave the Constitution as it is, with the two-thirds requirement in the Senate, or amend it, if we please, to bring the House into the picture with the two-thirds requirement, the people or the Congress, whichever way you want to express it, would have much more power in treaty making than if we were to amend it and provide for a simple majority vote in the ratification of treaties.

There are 531 Members elected, but, as I see it, the Congress is much more in the treaty-making business today, having the two-thirds requirement in the Senate, than it would be with a simple majority in both Houses.

Mr. MERROW. As it stands at present, you do not have true representation of the people, because a minority of the Senate has the veto power over treaties. If you were to require two-thirds of both Houses for ratification, you would still have a minority in control. This would not be proper representation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gossett). The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. What was your last question?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I tried to make it clear that it seems to me that all 531 Members of the Congress are, to all practical purposes, the representatives of the people. The Senators from my State certainly represent the people of Missouri just as much as I do. I know that in theory a Senator represents the State, but we must remember that formerly Senators were chosen because of their outstanding ability, the great contributions they were able to make because of their experience and their learning, but today when we have a direct primary, Senators are chosen just as we are. While they are chosen from a larger area in the larger States, I do not consider there is much more ability at the other end of the Capitol than there is in this body.

Mr. RAMEY. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. In the gentleman's address he directed our attention to the fact that there are two Senators elected from the State of Nevada with a population of 110,247. Two men represent that State with 110,247 population. Two persons—when I say "men" I mean whoever is elected—two persons represent the entire Commonwealth of New York with a population of over 13,000,000. Now, you say that the Senate represents the people. We in the House of Representatives are elected, each one representing so many people. The gentleman

directed our attention to the fact that the votes of 2 persons representing 110,247 people, carry twice as much weight as the votes of men from a Commonwealth that represents 13,479,142 people.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Would it not be true that if this amendment became a part of the Constitution those same two Senators from Nevada, representing a small number of people, would have just as much power in committing us to a treaty, and would it not be possible to have only 25 Senators commit us to a treaty—commit this Government to a treaty? I am just as much concerned with the danger of having a minority to commit us to a contract with another country as I am with a minority to prevent our unwise entry into any treaty negotiation.

Mr. RAMEY. If this goes to three-fourths of the States and they adopt what we will likely pass in the House day after tomorrow, then every treaty must be endorsed by a majority of both branches, both the representatives of the State, the Senate, and the representatives of the people, the House.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. If the gentleman will pardon my disagreement with him, in the first place, I think we are doing a lot of talking for nothing. I do not have the slightest doubt but what the Senate will act unfavorably upon this resolution if it ever gets to them.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that does not make the Senate's position any more right.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I think the Senate has no more ability in treaty making than this Body would have. There is no disagreement as far as bringing this Body into the picture as concerns the power of treaty making. I think we are all for that. I know of not a single Member who would object to that.

What we do object to is decreasing, or destroying, or breaking down the power of the Congress in treaty making and enhancing the power of the Executive. Talk about its being more democratic to pass this amendment; it seems to me the people through their chosen Representatives would have less power in treaty making than they now have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman from Missouri giving consideration to the situation of our Nation in the light of conditions in the rest of the world? Is he assuming the paramount question to be: What is the best policy; what method of ratifying treaties made with other nations is to our best national interest so that our country can assume its responsibility in the light of the position that it occupies in the world today?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. To my way of thinking these treaties are to last for a much longer period of time and are more important because of their very nature than an ordinary act of Congress or agreements concerning less profound subjects. In order for a treaty to be popular, indeed for it to prove satisfactory, it must have overwhelming support not only of a majority of the people in

this country, but of a majority of the people in the other nation or nations affected. To insure its lasting effect it should have the overwhelming support of the people at the time of adoption. I say this for the reason that we all know we are emotional at times. Fifty-one percent of us might support a proposition today, yet in 10 years there might be a shift in sentiment that would throw the support the other way by a percentage of one or two, whereas, that would be ovated if we required a 66⅔ percent vote for ratification.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation about a treaty's being presumed to last a long time is correct. However, the act of a subsequent Congress can supersede the act of ratification of a previous Congress. The question that addresses itself to me, however, and I believe to others likewise, is the position in which our country finds itself among the nations of the world, bearing in mind the great changes that have taken place. The fact that we are a creditor nation, the fact that we are one of the great nations of the world, the fact that isolation as far as space is concerned has been removed, has had its effect upon nations. What is best under these new circumstances for the United States of America in the world of today and tomorrow that it may carry out its destiny? What is best for our own national interest?

It certainly seems to me that the two-thirds rule, without criticizing its operation in the past, considering our duty, our problems of today and tomorrow as far as we reasonably can look into tomorrow, that the ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate is a serious obstacle to America's performing her duty of leadership among the nations of the world, against our country accomplishing her destiny. It seems to me that if we let the two-thirds principle remain in the Senate and on top of that require a two-thirds vote in the House we are only making more difficult our country's assuming its proper leadership among the nations of the world and that in the light of the world of today and tomorrow, it would be inconsistent with our national interest.

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. As I look to the future and view the possible role of our country in international affairs, I feel it may possibly be best to enter more and more into international agreements and have closer and more intimate relations with other countries; but I am vitally concerned and must insist that we have an overwhelming support of the people of this country when we enter into those international undertakings; I want us to be doubly sure of what we are doing. I am as interested in carrying out our business agreements with other countries as I am in making it easy to enter into them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very excellent thought and very proper. No one has any argument with the gentleman; I have not.

Let me ask the gentleman a further question. I suppose he has covered it heretofore. In the history of our country, there have been treaties which have

been refused ratification by one-third of the Senate plus one or two votes, yet the purposes of the treaty have been carried out by concurrent resolution. I have in mind, for example, Texas coming into the Union.

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where would this country be if we had simply adhered to the Senate provision of refusing to ratify the treaty and saying to Texas, "We do not want you in the Union"?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. There is nothing to prevent us accomplishing a similar act in a similar way in the future with existing treaty-making provisions.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says we have the power, outside of the treaty provision requiring two-thirds of the Senate, to ratify by concurrent resolution?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Because we have witnessed the spectacle in the past few years of an Executive entering into an agreement when perhaps there might have been a treaty, is no sign we should break down the treaty-making provision so that it will be easier for the Executive.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not admitting that the Executive has made Executive agreements which are, in fact, treaties. I recognize the fact that there might be an honest difference of opinion on that. However, the Chief Executive has the power to make Executive agreements by reason of being President of the United States. Of course, they must be concurred in by both branches of the Congress. I am speaking now about Executive agreements made outside of the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act where we have delegated the power to make them final.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The Congress has the power to initiate domestic legislation, such as a regular congressional enactment, and the President has the veto power. It would take a two-thirds vote of the Congress to override that veto. I recognize the power of the Executive to negotiate treaties, but I am very much concerned about keeping the power of the Congress to veto treaty making and to veto the President's exercise of the treaty-making power.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. As we sit here today and tomorrow and the next day particularly, would it not be a very bold man who would vote against the proposal to permit our States to pass upon the subject that the resolution sets forth? That must be done by a three-fourths majority. Would I not be a bold man to vote against giving the States the opportunity to say whether they want this changed or not?

Mr. MERROW. I would not want to take the responsibility for refusing to submit this amendment. I think it is the responsibility of the Congress to give the States an opportunity to vote on this question.

Mr. McCORMACK. In my previous observation about ratification by three-quarters of the legislatures of the States, that referred not to treaties but to an



amendment to the Constitution. I realize that unconsciously I conveyed a different thought, but I referred to the question of ratification of this resolution to amend the Constitution.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. It seems that would apply to any constitutional amendment that we initiate in the Congress. We could use the argument that we should let the people decide all these things. Congress could just freely initiate legislation to amend the Constitution. The gentleman would not be in favor of amending our rules for amending the Constitution, would he, which require a two-thirds vote in this body and the Senate and three-fourths of the State conventions?

Mr. McCORMACK. The interesting thing about that is that I would.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The gentleman would be in favor of making it easier to amend the Constitution?

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as a majority vote of both branches of Congress is concerned, I introduced an amendment at a Constitutional Convention in Massachusetts which brought about that very thing. We had in Massachusetts a provision to the effect that an amendment to the Constitution required a two-thirds vote of both branches of the legislature for 2 successive years, in other words, two successive sessions of the legislature. All amendments have to be submitted to the people. Back in 1917 I introduced a resolution.

I proposed an amendment to the Constitution that it should be by majority vote in joint session of both branches of the legislature for 2 consecutive years, and it is now a part of the Constitution. Even if my friend completely disagrees with me, my answer is that I would. But that has nothing to do with this particular question.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. It has to do with this particular question. If this provision for simple majority in both Houses read so that it was necessary to have a simple majority of all duly elected Members, it would not be quite so bad. You would not be letting down the bars quite so bad as the requirement of only a majority of those present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, since we have taken so much of the gentleman's time, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. May I just say to the gentleman from Missouri that I am as much concerned as he in having an overwhelming support by the people for our foreign policy. But it does seem to me that if we amend the Constitution so that under the most extreme instances we would have 110 men of the House and 25 men of the Senate voting on it that we would have a far better representation of what the people wish than we do at the present time when one-third plus 1 or 33 Senators, can destroy any treaty that is submitted to that body.

In the seventh place, the Chief Executive of the United States works under a tremendous handicap in international conferences because he cannot negotiate with anywhere near the freedom possessed by diplomats from other countries.

Eighth. The two-thirds rule weakens the legislative branch of the Government; first, because the House has no voice in treaty making; and, second, the Senate is under the domination of a small minority.

Ninth. There exists confusion concerning the relationship of joint resolutions and treaties. This would end with the adoption of the proposed amendment.

Tenth. The two-thirds rule in its present form emphasizes sectional and minority interests at the expense of national and majority interests. The Nation's primary interest today is to have a positive national foreign policy supported by and responsive to a majority of the people.

Eleventh. The conclusion of international undertakings being increasingly imperative for the protection and furtherance of the Nation's interests, the practical choice is either to compromise the Nation's interests through failure to conclude adequate international undertakings or to find an alternative to the unworkable two-thirds procedural requirement for treaties.

Twelfth. The two-thirds rule is a constant political barrier to the development of an adequate, generally recognized majority action procedure through the use of joint resolutions; and, thirteenth, a majority of both Houses is more likely to represent the views of more people and more organs of public opinion than is a one-third minority or a two-thirds majority of the Senate. The foregoing are sound and compelling reasons for immediately adopting the amendment under discussion.

#### THE HOUSE MUST ASSUME LEADERSHIP

This House must assume the leadership in the drive to democratize our treaty-making machinery just as it did in initiating and passing the Fulbright resolution approving United States membership in an international organization to halt aggression. Last December the Committee on the Judiciary conducted hearings on several resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties. Those who appeared before the committee and the statements presented were nearly unanimous against the two-thirds rule. In fact I have been unable to discover but few people outside of the United States Senate who believe that the present method of validating treaties should be continued. For self-protection and for increasing its voice in international affairs the Senate should be more interested in passing this resolution than is the House. Under existing conditions the majority of a great legislative branch of the Congress finds itself helpless and powerless in exercising the will of a majority of its Members. Recent polls show that a majority of the Nation wishes to strike out the impeditive two-thirds requirement. By adopting this resolution

the House will be acting in accord with the wishes of the American people.

#### STATE LEGISLATURES IN SESSION

Over forty of the State legislatures are convening this year. If we act at once it is possible for the amendment to become a part of the Constitution within a few months. On the 17th of January I addressed a joint session of the New Hampshire General Court on this subject. A few days later the legislature passed unanimously a resolution asking Congress to act upon House Joint Resolution 16 which I introduced on the 3d of January, 1945. House Joint Resolution 60 contains the same proposition as my measure. I am pleased to report that New Hampshire has taken action in asking the Congress to present to the States this amendment. I predict that if this Congress will grant the States the opportunity to act, New Hampshire will be in the vanguard of the States leading the procession for bringing about this constitutional reform. The Seventy-ninth Congress could perform no act which would so increase the faith of the people in representative government as to give the State legislatures an opportunity to vote on this question while they are in session this year. Now is the time for the National Legislature to rise to a high position of leadership and make an incalculable contribution to future generations by beginning to develop governmental procedure to meet the problems of this modern age. It is the duty of this Congress to give the people a chance to pass judgment on this amendment through their legislatures. The responsibility for refusing to submit this amendment is so terrifying that those who oppose giving the Nation a chance to express its will must ponder long and seriously on the position they take.

#### INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION ONLY ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

The present system plays definitely into the hands of obstructionists and into the hands of those who would have this Nation try to retreat from the theater of international affairs after the tanks have ceased to move and the bombers have completed their missions. The only alternative to recurring world wars is an international organization sufficiently powerful to check an aggressor when he first begins his march of conquest. By actually participating in an association of nations to effect world unity we will be doing our part as a great power in seeking a way to avoid world anarchy.

Many responsible leaders in both major political parties have expressed themselves as favoring an international organization implemented by force to preserve the peace. Many leaders of public opinion have been working diligently for an organization to end aggression and to avert future global conflicts. Here is an excellent opportunity for one and all to demonstrate their sincerity by putting their influence behind its proposed constitutional reform. If we do not adopt this amendment the United States of America will go into the post-war period shackled by a procedure which will make impossible the exercising of its full influence

as a responsible power in shaping a civilization free from war. If we do not adopt this amendment this Republic will enter the post-war period with a constitution mechanism for dealing with international affairs that is pitifully inadequate to meet the exigencies of the trying years that lie ahead. This is the first major move in accomplishing the objective which we all are striving to reach.

The Congress has stated that it is in favor of entering a world organization. Here is an opportunity by supporting this amendment to prove that we meant what we said when we passed legislation pledging our participation. If the men and women in and out of Congress who have been talking about peace plans are anxious to give more than lip service to the achievement of a warless world, they will unhesitatingly do everything conceivable to create constitutional machinery which will actually make possible an organization for world peace.

The first action necessary in developing an enlightened foreign policy is to amend the Constitution so that a majority in both Houses of Congress may validate treaties. Such an amendment would strengthen the hands of our negotiators at the peace table. Such an amendment would permit a majority of the people's Representatives to participate in creating a just and an enduring peace. Such an amendment would strip from the hands of a small minority the dictation of our foreign policy. Such an amendment would be an announcement to the world that the United States of America actually intends to assist in organizing a peaceful society and in laying the foundations for international good will. Such an amendment would remove a glaring defect in the Constitution and would make this Republic far more influential in the direction of world affairs. It would end our impotence in concluding treaties and would give new hope to those of the present generation as well as afford the means by which people of the future may escape the curse of war.

#### PRESENT METHOD MUST END

The antiquated, unworkable, archaic, obstructive, undemocratic, and indefensible method of approving treaties must be ended, if this great Republic is to have a voice of influence in the international councils of the future. By the opinions expressed in the letters which I have received from all sections of the country, I am sure that the Nation will rally to the support of this amendment and by so doing make the greatest possible single contribution in establishing our leadership in the struggle for world unity. Just as the youth of America are fighting and achieving military successes on the battle fronts, so must we work for and win victories at the peace table. If those in our armed forces are not to be let down by the country and by those who are privileged to move in that distinguished group referred to as statesmen, then we must act promptly to preserve the fruits of their victories. The eyes of the world are upon this Congress as we consider the revision of our constitutional machinery for making peace.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, and to include in one an editorial and in the other a radio address.

#### THE ITALIAN CAMPAIGN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I spoke briefly on the gallantry of American and Allied soldiers who had endured the long winter stalemate in Italy. This stalemate had not been a time of inaction. It had been a time of cruel and bitter fighting, in a climate that disabled as many of our soldiers as died by artillery or small-arms fire. But that dogged bulldog persistence has finally worn down the enemy. Today, some of the best news of the war is that our troops have broken out into the Lombardy Plain and are chasing the Germans north.

I think that we should pause for a few moments and review the last two brilliant weeks in Italy. The battles in Germany are taking the big headlines. But that is all the more reason why we should recall, in this hour of triumph, the part of the American and Allied soldier who fought one of the toughest holding actions in history. They pinned down crack German divisions. They moved over some of the toughest terrain, from a military point of view, that any of our armies have encountered and, for the last few months, they have fought with almost no recognition. In this hour, they must not be the forsaken men. They must have their full mead of just praise.

On April 12 our lines in the Apennines extended from Gragnana and Carrara, the famous marble center near the Ligurian Sea, across the mountains, bulging north to pass through Castelnovo and Vergato, dipping slightly south at Tossignano, and then swooping north across the flat plains east of Bologna to the Comacchio Lagoon. Gen. Mark Clark's Fifth Army, commanded by Lt. Gen. Lucien K. Truscott, held the lines in the western and central Apennines. The British Eighth Army, with troops of seven nations, commanded by Gen. Sir Richard McCreery, held the lines where they descended out of the Apennines and stretched north and east toward the Adriatic. The American Twelfth Air Force supported the whole line in this treacherous, flying country where to bomb out a bridge in a valley, you had to skim a mountain top, swoop on your target with only a few seconds to spot it, and pull up for the next peak before you smashed the ship.

The German withdrawal began on the 14th of April. They usually attack before withdrawal, hoping to pin down our forward units and escape with supplies intact.

But what they meant for an orderly, and perhaps a partial withdrawal, has

turned into something else. The Allies, who had been waiting for some sign of weakness in this brilliantly contested battle, seized the initiative. By April 15 it was evident to the Americans that the golden moment had come—the moment they had awaited through a winter as cruel and snowy as that at Valley Forge.

On April 15, 1,233 heavy bombers of the Fifteenth Air Force flew over our lines in the central and western Apennines, and descended on the richest targets—the German artillery concentrations, their ammunition dumps, and the big convoys moving back of the lines. That night Allied artillery poured 75,000 shells into enemy positions. Then came the moment of the Infantry jump-off. How those troops have longed to move—really move. How they have read with envy the dispatches from the north, telling of 30-mile dashes over flat country, when a smashing attack for them has usually netted a mile. How they have longed for strength—real strength—not the fairly thin disposition of foot soldiers and artillery, not much stronger than the enemy's. Now, reinforcements had moved in, notably the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Regimental Combat team, Japanese-Americans who had been fighting in France. Now tons of supplies had been quietly moved up—put ashore from the port at Leghorn, the port which our engineers had brilliantly repaired after thorough Nazi destruction.

Missouri mules had toiled to bring in the supplies—toiled up mountain sides so steep that Italian donkeys would have dug in their hoofs and said "no."

The full weight of our force was ready for the big punch. Three hours after the Infantry jump-off, Fifth Army troops dominated the 2,200 foot peak east of Highway 24, one of the main Italian supply arteries.

After the big assault got under way, our troops never really stopped. They moved forward over those heart-breaking mountains day and night. That is ground made for defense—where the enemy is always perched on a ridge, looking down your throat. He shells you with 88's. He improvises huge balls of cement, filling them with TNT and rolling them down on you. Then, when you have inched up on him, rock by rock, crawling, sweating, firing, crawling a little more, when you have nearly gained the ridge, he withdraws—runs hastily down the slope, through the valley, up the next slope, and holds another ridge and you have it to do all over again. You always work uphill.

Fighting that way, mountain by mountain, the First Armored Division took Mount Radicchio, the Tenth Mountain Division took Mount Mosca. The Thirty-fourth found itself in hand-to-hand conflict near Gorgognano, struggling to gain the summit, where strong German artillery emplacements, in a ruined church, held back the Americans for hours. By the time that height was gained, so many soldiers had died, so much sheer guts had been shown by the assault troops, that veterans of the fight compare it to the struggle for Hill 609 in Tunisia.

Through this bitter fighting the Germans held onto Bologna, making it the



pivot city of their resistance, and there was worried talk among our troops that this might turn out to be another Aachen. Perhaps the Germans had strength enough to hold them up, with the great forces gathered at Bologna. But 5 days of mountain-by-mountain advance has brought the Fifth Army to the foothills south of Bologna and to downhill going. Two divisions, with armor, burst from the mountains into the plains. On the next day Bologna fell, but our troops raced through and around it. All divisions were now down from the mountains and chasing the Germans across the flat northern Italian plains, in that great mass advance which our G. I.'s and our generals have dreamed about. If our eager young Americans on their heels have anything to say about it, it will be only the ghost of 26 German divisions that will make the Brenner Pass.

Already we have taken over 50,000 prisoners. Good flying weather has brought our fighter-bombers down in force on the disorganized Germans. South of the Po, where frantic Nazi divisions piled up temporarily in an effort to figure out how to cross the river, the Desert Air Force reported seeing about 300 enemy vehicles set on fire to keep them out of our hands. The news from Italy looks very good.

Let me speak my tribute, then, to the soldiers in Italy. To their gallant leaders, Gen. Mark Clark, Lt. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott and Gen. Sir Richard L. McCleery. To the men themselves—the engineers, the armored-force men, the artillery, the medics, the supply troops and the Twelfth and the Fifteenth Air Forces.

And then, let me speak finally of the foot soldier. Italy was his fight. The mountains made it mainly his fight. Let us remember the courage and endurance of the great infantry divisions—the Eighty-fifth, the Eighty-eighth, the Ninety-second, a Negro division to which Japanese-American troops are now attached, and the Thirty-fourth.

These men have endured hard and cruel months of see-saw action in the lonely Apennines. For them, this winter, the arrival of a mule train was a big event. The continuous snow and the rain froze their hands and feet, gave them trench foot, and rheumatism. Their fighting has been continuous. In daytime they slept in fox holes, hacked out of the rocky soil, and they prayed that the sun would come through. At night the fighting began, the fighting that must have seemed sometimes so futile, because it was so costly in lives and so poor in inches gained. The next morning we would read of them in a few unemotional lines—"Slight patrol action south of Vergato." But if we sometimes felt discouraged about Italy, apparently they did not. For they are now on the loose, and from the rate they have moved, their energies are fresh and their spirits high.

These American foot soldiers of ours have chalked up another great triumph. They are amazing young men.

Let us honor them for their great fighting ability, for their bravery, and for the outstanding contributions they have

made to the winning of the war in Europe.

Let us honor them because of the honor, which will occupy outstanding pages in history, that they have brought to all Americans and to our country.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. McCOWEN (at the request of Mr. McGREGOR) for today, April 30, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEICHEL, for May 1 and 2, on account of hearings on official business.

To Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1984. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2625. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 689. An act to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State;

H. R. 1525. An act relating to escapes of prisoners of war and interned enemy aliens;

H. R. 1701. An act to amend section 2, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress;

H. R. 1719. An act to confirm the claim of Charles Gaudet;

H. R. 1984. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2625. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, May 2, 1945.

##### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold an executive session at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, May 3, 1945, in the committee room, 356 House Office Building.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

419. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request that two estimates of \$3,000,000 and \$2,235,000 for a sample census of population and a quarterly survey of the labor force, be added to the program already submitted by the President on January 31, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

420. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$77,500,000 for the Office of Scientific Research and Development (H. Doc. No. 162); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

421. A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, as enacted by Act 1 of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1945; to the Committee on the Territories.

422. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

423. A letter from the secretary of the Board of Commissioners, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting in compliance with section 6, Public Law 327, Seventy-seventh Congress, a copy of semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, covering operations from July 1, to December 31, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

424. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate employment of necessary personnel in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

425. A letter from the Director of Office of Contract Settlement, transmitting the third quarterly report by the Director of Contracts Settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

426. A letter from the Chairman of Surplus Property Board, transmitting the advice that the report of the Surplus Property Board will be delayed a few days in transmission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

427. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, for war training service, Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

428. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

429. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of various

legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

430. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a suggested draft of legislation covering relief for the Chief Disbursing Officer and certain other officers and former officers of this Department for various suspensions, disallowances, and unavailable items in their accounts; to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. Supplemental report pursuant to H. R. 2068. A bill to provide for the settlement of claim of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or lost, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; without amendment (Rept. No. 237, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 174. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2615. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 1111. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Fort Peck project, Montana; with amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2119. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2231. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2457. A bill to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 487. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 488. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 62. An act to amend

section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding \$300,000 from the provisions of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2600. A bill to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 78. An act for the relief of the estate of William Edward Oates; without amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 174. An act for the relief of Mary Martha Withers, as trustee; Mary Martha Withers, as administratrix of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased; and Mary Martha Withers, individually; without amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 316. An act for the relief of June I. Gradjan; without amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 328. An act for the relief of James A. Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack; without amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. S. 467. An act for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. S. 491. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. S. 591. An act for the relief of Chesley Brazil; without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Herman Gelb; with amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1562. A bill for the relief of the borough of Park Ridge, Park Ridge, N. J.; with amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Michael C. Donatelli; with amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Domenico Strangio; without amendment (Rept. No.

479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2003. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Stewart Martin, Jr., a minor, with amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3014) for the relief of Stanley S. Kutkowsky, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: H. R. 3077. A bill amending the Nationality Act of 1940 to prohibit the naturalization of citizens of Germany for 25 years after the termination of the European phase of the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTLETT: H. R. 3078. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Gold Creek and its tributaries, Alaska, for flood control, for run-off and waterflow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CHENOWETH: H. R. 3079. A bill to prescribe the period within which actions may be commenced under section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COFFEE: H. R. 3080. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the eastern district of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS: H. J. Res. 175. A bill for an Ernie Pyle memorial; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: H. Con. Res. 50. A bill declaring Congress to have recognized and approved the provisions of section 29-23 (m)-16 of Treasury Regulations 111, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: H. Res. 236. A bill directing the Committee on the Territories to conduct a study and investigation of various questions and problems relating to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt House bills 2032 and 2033 in furtherance of preventing beach erosion; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt and submit to the several States the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Filipino Commonwealth, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States by an expression of thankfulness for the passage of the naturalization bill as an indication of confidence to the Filipino people; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.



Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States by an expression of full support for and confidence in President Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 703 of title 8 of the United States Code Annotated so as to extend the right to become a naturalized citizen to Polynesian persons or persons of Polynesian descent; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration for people of Jewish descent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted in Congress to transfer Fort Ringgold and Fort Clark to the State of Texas for eleemosynary service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States by expressing deep sympathy in regard to the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Memorials.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reconsider the proposed plans to draft all skilled farm help and skilled workers processing dairy products for the military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to prices for fresh fruits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in regard to the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Memorials.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take certain steps in relation to the payment of State gasoline and motor vehicle registration taxes arising out of the operation by the Federal Government of certain truck lines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States by endorsing wage readjustment of salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to exempt all patient employees and paroled-patient employees at Kalaupapa settlement from any Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of August Svelund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 3082. A bill for the relief of John Philip Knecht, Sr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FOAGE:

H. R. 3083. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Mae Boone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 3084. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3085. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3086. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wilma G. Vest; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

473. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition of the Knights of Equity, Court No. 5, regarding the future of the Polish Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

474. Also, petition of Polish-American Citizens Committee, concerning the future of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

475. Also, petition by the Assembly of the State of New York, concerning equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

476. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of sundry residents of Fulton County, Ill., requesting that the alcoholic beverage industry be prohibited from advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

477. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Walter Feldkamp and 30 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

478. Also, petition of Anna Rose Murcurio and 30 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479. Also, petition of Catherine Fania and 30 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

480. Also, petition of Edward L. Burkhart and 33 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

481. Also, petition of Charles Pisani and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

482. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of eastern Massachusetts district, Polish-American Congress, Inc., for the recognition of the principle that all nations be bound by the moral law and an international bill of rights for all individuals and all peoples that would guarantee freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and respect for human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

483. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt and submit to the several States the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment is now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

484. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Italian-American Democratic League of New Jersey, protesting and calling upon the President, the Members of Congress, the Secretary of State, and other officials representing this country at the San Francisco Conference to oppose and reject the claims and demands of Marshal Tito for Trieste, Gorizia, Fiume, and any and all other territory which is part of the Kingdom of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

485. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago favoring wage adjustments to meet increased living costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

486. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Toilet Goods Association, Inc., New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to increasing salaries

of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

487. Also, petition of the city of St. Paul, by the office of the city clerk, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to adoption by Congress of Senate bill 717, which provides for Federal aid for education; to the Committee on Education.

488. Also, petition of the Pan-American League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

489. Also, petition of Local No. 2 of Brooklyn and Queen waiters and waitresses union, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an expression of sympathy in regard to the untimely passing of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and pledging their support to his successor, President Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Memorials.

490. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expression of deep sorrow at the untimely death of the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and pledging their support to his successor, Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Memorials.

491. Also, petition of Manhattan Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress to approve the Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, Mexico City, and Crimea Conference proposals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

492. Also, petition of Missouri River States Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the development of the Missouri River Basin and concerning authority measures now before the Congress; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

493. Also, petition of the Pan-American League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to going on record for endorsement of the Bretton Woods agreement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

494. Also, petition of the Pan-American League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to prompt adoption of the Mexican water-rights bill in the United States Senate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

495. Also, petition of the Pan-American League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the Bretton Woods agreement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

496. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of King County, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable enactment of House bill 2071, postal employees' legislation, into law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

497. Also, petition of the Textile Foundation, Industrial Building, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

498. Also, petition of Dorsey W. McMahan, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the issuance of a deportation order in his behalf by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

499. Also, petition of the city of Struthers, Ohio, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to an expression of deep sympathy in regard to the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Memorials.

500. Also, petition of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the Missouri Valley Authority now being considered in Congress; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.